

Also, a bill (H. R. 11565) to make valid and payable the insurance of Ray L. Stockstill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 11566) granting a pension to Charles A. Marsteller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11567) granting an increase of pension to Hannah C. Bunch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 11568) for the relief of Russell & Tucker and certain other citizens of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11569) for the relief of Adolph Morales; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11570) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Springer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11571) granting an increase of pension to Dorcas Lashley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1880. By Mr. ANDREW: Communication from Parish Circle of First Church of Christ, of Bradford, Mass., opposing any modification of the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1881. Also, communication from Tabernacle Church of Salem, Mass., protesting against any modification of the Volstead law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1882. Also, petition from Corporal Gordon E. Denton Post 319, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Boston, Mass., favoring the establishment of a unified air service under the direction of a Cabinet officer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1883. Also, communication from members of First United Church, Swampscott, Mass., opposing any change in the prohibition amendment or the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1884. By Mr. FENN: Resolutions of the Slovene-Greek Society, Assembly No. 158, of Unionville, Conn., protesting against the passage of certain bills now pending before the Committee on Immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1885. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Law Printers Division of the United Typothetae of America, urging more complete enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1886. Also, petition of Milburn Bros., of Rockford, Ill., urging support of House bill 8902; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1887. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Women's Auxiliary, Church of the Epiphany, Dorchester, Mass., Alice Erickson, 27 Walton Street, Dorchester, Mass., president; Sadie F. Taylor, 3 Carlos Street, Dorchester, Mass., secretary, opposing passage of House bill 7826; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1888. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Memorial adopted by Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, favoring legislation for official grading and marking of beef carcasses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1889. By Mr. KINDRED: Resolution of Carl Tollen Unit No. 103, Steuben Society of America, urging the Congress of the United States to support passage of House bill 10820, for return of enemy alien property; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1890. By Mr. KING: Petition signed by Elias Hallengren and eight other citizens of Galesburg, Ill., stating that they are in favor of the Volstead Act, and that they believe that the dry sentiment is very strong throughout the State and Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1891. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of certain citizens, members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and members of six of the churches of Nevada, Vernon County, Mo., protesting against any modification of the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1892. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Resolution of the district of Minnesota of the American Turner Bund, advocating the modification of the so-called Volstead Act so as to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines under proper Government regulations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1893. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of Wingate & Cullen, of New York City, favoring the passage of Senate bill 2607 and House bill 7479, the game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1894. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Mr. C. E. Grasser and 121 others, of Epping and Williston, N. Dak., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1895. By Mr. WELLER: Petition of Metal Trades Council of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging immediate consideration of House bill 7, a bill increasing the retirement allowances of Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1896. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of H. H. Bergmann, Mrs. H. E. Greene, Elizabeth Meyer, and others, protesting against the enactment of Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

FRIDAY, April 23, 1926

(Legislative day of Monday, April 19, 1926)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ferris	King	Reed, Pa.
Bayard	Fess	La Follette	Sackett
Bingham	Frazier	McKellar	Sheppard
Blease	George	McKinley	Shipstead
Borah	Gerry	McLean	Shortridge
Bratton	Goff	McMaster	Smoot
Broussard	Gooding	McNary	Stanfield
Bruce	Greene	Mayfield	Steck
Cameron	Hale	Neely	Stephens
Copeland	Harrell	Norbeck	Swanson
Couzens	Harris	Nye	Trammell
Cummings	Harrison	Oddie	Tyson
Curtis	Heflin	Overman	Wadsworth
Dale	Johnson	Pepper	Warren
Deneen	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Watson
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Wheeler
Edge	Kendrick	Ransdell	Williams
Fernald	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Willis

Mr. PHIPPS. My colleague the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MEANS] is absent on account of illness. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. OVERMAN. My colleague the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] is unavoidably absent. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

BOULDER CANYON PROJECT

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to report back favorably with amendments from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation the bill (S. 3331) to provide for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I give notice that on tomorrow I shall submit my individual views in opposition to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. And at that time the majority views will be submitted as well.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation I have been requested to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the vote by which the Boulder Canyon project bill was ordered reported favorably from that committee this morning by the Senator from California. I desire to state that those voting in favor of a favorable report on the bill were Senators JONES of Washington, GOODING, ODDIE, SHORTRIDGE, JOHNSON, SHEPPARD, WALSH, KENDRICK, PITTMAN, SIMMONS, DILL, and the chairman of the committee. Those opposing a favorable report of the bill were Senator PHIPPS, and Senators CAMERON and ASHURST, of Arizona.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT (S. DOC. NO. 101)

Mr. CUMMINS. I present an order and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection the order was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the articles of impeachment presented against George W. English, district judge of the United States for the eastern district of Illinois, be printed for the use of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hattigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 9758. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Vicksburg Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Vicksburg, Miss.;

H. R. 9964. An act releasing and granting to the city of Chicago any and all reversionary rights of the United States in and to the streets, alleys, and public grounds in Fort Dearborn addition to Chicago;

H. R. 10164. An act granting the consent of Congress to Cape Girardeau Chamber of Commerce (Inc.) to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Cape Girardeau, Mo.; and

H. R. 10351. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Natchez-Vidalia Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Natchez, Miss.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Mr. WILLIS presented resolutions adopted by the board of trade of the city of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of the bill (S. 3069) to enforce the liability of common carriers for loss of or damage to grain shipped in bulk, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the council of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the passage of the so-called Stanfield-Lehlbach civil service employees' retirement bill, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. McNARY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I have received from a commendable organization.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., April 7, 1926.

CHARLES L. McNARY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Oregon Indian Welfare Association protests Hayden bill, 9133, amended by committee without hearing, validating 420 illegal Fall applications. Enter this protest in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to committee. Advise members Oregon delegation of our opposition not only to action committee but to bill itself.

MILLER R. TRUMBULL.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. FERNALD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 3738) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the United States marine hospital reservation and improvements thereon at Detroit, Mich., and to acquire a suitable site in the same locality and to erect thereon a modern hospital for the treatment of the beneficiaries of the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1924, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 651) thereon.

Mr. KING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5006) to detach Hickman County from the Nashville division of the middle judicial district of the State of Tennessee and attach the same to the Columbia division of the middle judicial district of said State, reported it without amendment.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4061) to consolidate certain forest lands within the Cache National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. COUZENS:

A bill (S. 4062) for the relief of Charles F. Getchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4063) for the relief of Helen F. Griffin; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4064) granting a pension to Kirby W. Smith; and

A bill (S. 4065) granting an increase of pension to Jaley W. Flook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 4066) granting an increase of pension to Clarinda H. Mayo; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4067) to amend in certain particulars the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 4068) transferring a portion of the lands of the military reservation of the Presidio of San Francisco

to the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 4069) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange for lands in private ownership in Gunnison County, Colo., certain public lands in Delta County, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 4070) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River at or near Burlington, N. J.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4071) to amend sections 213 and 215, act of March 4, 1909 (Criminal Code), relating to offenses against the Postal Service, and sections 3929 and 4041, Revised Statutes, relating to the exclusion of fraudulent devices and lottery paraphernalia from the mails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 4072) granting an increase of pension to Evelyn C. Widney (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 4074) for the relief of M. Zingarell and wife, Mary Alice Zingarell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 4075) for the relief of Ralph H. Lasher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4076) for the relief of Ruth Evelyn Stockstill, widow of Ray L. Stockstill, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 99) making an appropriation to defray the expenses incident to the impeachment trial of Judge George W. English; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 100) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOUTHERN APPALACHIAN PARKS

Mr. SWANSON. In behalf of my colleague [Mr. GLASS], the two Senators from North Carolina, and the two Senators from Tennessee, and for myself, I introduce a bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The bill (S. 4073) to provide for the establishment of the Shenandoah National Park in the State of Virginia and the Great Smoky Mountain National Park in the States of North Carolina and Tennessee, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAW

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6238) to amend the immigration act of 1924, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NORTHERN CHEYENNE RESERVATION LANDS, MONT.

Mr. WHEELER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9558) to provide for allotting in severalty agricultural lands within the Tongue River or Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation in Montana, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 6774.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it was understood yesterday that on this morning we would take up the motion which was entered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] for a reconsideration of the vote by which the Italian debt settlement bill was passed. I ask now that that motion may be considered by the Senate.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I said to the Senator from Utah yesterday that I would be prepared to take up the matter to-day. I did not understand that I had agreed to take it up the very first moment the Senate convened. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL], who is more interested than I am in the matter, is not in the Chamber at the moment. I have sent for him and just as soon as he comes I will call up the motion.

Mr. SMOOT. I did desire that the motion might be disposed of before taking up the settlement of the Belgian indebtedness.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIS. I was wondering at this moment, when the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Missouri, who have charge of this matter, are both on the floor, whether we could not have some understanding as to what the program is to be for to-morrow. Some of us are compelled to be absent from the Chamber to-morrow. I, for one, should like to know what the program is to be for to-morrow's session. Can either the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Missouri give the Senate any information on that point?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understood that there was a tacit agreement that we should dispose of the amendment to-day, which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] submitted, and which was rejected. Just as soon as the amendment shall have been disposed of on a motion to reconsider I desire to have the Senate take up the Belgian debt settlement bill, and that bill no doubt will be before the Senate to-morrow.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Missouri think, if I may propound the inquiry, that that tacit arrangement can be carried out?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I am obliged to differ from my friend from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] in one respect. There is no "tacit agreement" that the motion to reconsider will be disposed of to-day. I have no right to make such an agreement; but I say now that I think if the amendment shall be brought on for debate it will be disposed of to-day. I have no desire to delay the Senate beyond the point where the matter may be discussed. As soon as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] comes in I shall be prepared, if it shall then be convenient to the Senate, to take the floor.

Mr. WILLIS. I want to say to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that that course is entirely agreeable if we can have a vote on the matter to-day. If not, I should like to have some arrangement made so that we could vote on it on Monday. I should be sorry to miss the vote on the question, but there are some Senators who are compelled to be absent from the Chamber to-morrow.

Mr. SMOOT. I feel confident that we shall get a vote to-day.

INTERNATIONAL MAP OF THE WORLD

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I occupy a moment while the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] is coming to the Chamber by asking unanimous consent to consider two joint resolutions? If no Senator desires to take up the intervening time, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business No. 604 on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, let the title of the joint resolution be stated from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 149) to provide for membership of the United States in the Central Bureau of the International Map of the World.

Mr. BORAH. This joint resolution proposes to authorize an appropriation of \$30 to enable us to have a part in the making of a geological map.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I ask has the joint resolution the approval of the Budget Bureau? [Laughter.]

Mr. BORAH. I presume so, for the joint resolution came over from the House of Representatives.

Mr. KING. Did the Senator from Idaho state that the joint resolution would involve the expenditure of 30 cents or \$30?

Mr. BORAH. The joint resolution involves an expenditure of either \$20 or \$30, but I think it is \$30.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution. It provides that to enable the United States to become a member of the Central Bureau of the International Map of the World there shall be appropriated \$30 for the payment of a contribution by the United States toward the expenses of the bureau for the calendar year 1926.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CENTENNIAL OF 1826 PAN AMERICAN CONGRESS

Mr. BORAH. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 605, which is of a little more consequence than the joint resolution which has just been passed.

Mr. KING. Let the title of the joint resolution be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the title of the joint resolution.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 150) to provide for the participation of the United States in a congress to be held in the city of Panama June, 1926, in commemoration of the centennial of the Pan American Congress which was held in the city of Panama in 1826.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it will be recalled that there was a Pan American Congress held in 1826 which was of some considerable moment at that time and was regarded as of great importance as affecting the United States and South American and Central American countries. This joint resolution is simply an authorization for us to participate in the centennial of the meeting of the congress of 1826.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution. It proposes to authorize the President of the United States to appoint delegates to enable the United States to participate in the Pan American Congress to be held in the city of Panama in June, 1926, in commemoration of the centennial of the Pan American Congress which met in that city in June, 1826, and to appropriate for the expenses of the United States in participating in such conference, including the travel and subsistence expenses of such delegates (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), and such miscellaneous and other expenses as the President shall deem proper, the sum of \$1,500.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho a question in reference to the joint resolution. Did the Government of the United States not decline to participate in the Pan American Congress of 1826?

Mr. BORAH. My recollection is that we did not decline to do so, but there was an extended debate in the Senate and in the House of Representatives over whether or not we should participate. Mr. Clay, I know, took an active part in the discussion, but my remembrance is that we finally consented to participate. However, whether we did so or not, we should now participate 100 years afterwards.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will yield to me, I desire to suggest that my recollection is that a delegate to the congress on behalf of the United States was appointed, but that the congress adjourned before his arrival.

Mr. BORAH. That is correct.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROPOSED FRENCH DEBT SETTLEMENT

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, while the motion to reconsider the vote by which the Italian debt settlement bill was passed is being discussed and before we shall take up the Belgian debt settlement and the debt settlements with the other smaller countries, it seems to me, in view of what has been printed in the newspapers this morning, it might be very appropriate if the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] would inform the Senate of some of the terms of the settlement which it is proposed that we shall make with France.

As I read the newspapers this morning they carry the statement that the United States and France have virtually agreed upon terms of the settlement of the debt due by France to the United States, and it may be that some Senators would desire to compare those terms with the terms of other foreign debt settlements.

I recall that when the American commission met with the French delegates on the first occasion, when they failed to agree, it was thought by some that the matter would be put off indefinitely and that nothing could be done. Indeed, it has been argued in the course of the debate on the Italian debt settlement that if the Senate did not ratify it we should get nothing from Italy, that one could not "get blood out of a turnip." It seems to me from the terms printed in the newspapers as to the proposed debt settlement with France that we are to get a little more out of France than we should have received had the debt settlement as formerly proposed gone through and been agreed to. Therefore, will not the Senator from Utah at this very appropriate time inform the Senate, as the newspapers seem to have informed the country, touching the terms of the settlement of the French debt to the United States?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the first meeting in reference to the French debt settlement was held this morning at 9.30 o'clock. That was the first time the French ambassador or any representative of France appeared before the Debt Commission since the Caillaux mission was here. I wish to say to the Senator and to the country that any information which

has been published in the press in reference to the matter has come from other sources than the members of the Debt Commission. I think it has come through France.

The Debt Commission met for a short time this morning. There was a Cabinet meeting also this morning, and the Secretary of the Treasury had to attend that meeting. We were in session for only about 20 minutes. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that the French ambassador presented a proposition on behalf of France, but, to tell the truth, I have not even read it; I do not know what it contains. I have not had time to read it.

I will also say to the Senator from Mississippi that the Debt Commission will meet to-morrow morning again for the purpose of taking under consideration the proposition made by the French ambassador on behalf of France.

Mr. HARRISON. Then, if I understand the Senator from Utah, if there is any tentative agreement, it has been made without the cooperation and advice and counsel of the Senator from Utah, but in large degree by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in answer to that, I wish to say that there has been no tentative arrangement made with France, as there was not in the case of other countries sending commissions over here, which presented propositions for the funding of their debts to the commission. As I have read day by day what the newspapers have had to say as to the form the settlement would assume, I knew that there was no true basis for the statements.

I have no doubt that the press was informed, perhaps through French sources, that certain rates were going to be agreed upon, but there has not been a member of the commission who has said that there is a tentative agreement or that there has been any meeting at all for the purpose of discussing whether a proposal from France would or would not be accepted; in fact, the commission did not know until this morning what the proposal from France would be.

Mr. HARRISON. Then the Senator does not know anything about the terms of this proposed agreement?

Mr. SMOOT. I have the proposition at my office, but I have not had time to read it, and I can not tell the Senator what its terms are.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator, perhaps, saw the New York Herald of this morning, containing an article which is headed:

French debt pact taken up to-day. Both sides are virtually agreed.

I am just wondering if that is the way the Italian debt settlement was put over; that one commissioner agreed to it and that the other commissioners, who have been praised in the course of this debate, some of whom have been described as Democrats—and appeals have been made to this side because Democrats helped to negotiate the settlement, then gave their consent. I am wondering if the same method was employed in securing the agreement which we have here.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the statement in the press is not true. There has been no "virtual agreement"; there has been no agreement whatever; in fact, there has not been a word said by the commission that would lead to an agreement. The only thing that has been done by the commission is, as I have already said, they met to-day; they received the proposition from the French ambassador, but I have not had time even to read it.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is aware that practically every news service of the country has carried substantially the same article that is carried in substance by the New York Herald.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that for the last week or 10 days statements to that effect have been published, but there is no basis whatever for them, I will say to the Senator. If France had made up her mind as to what she was going to offer and undertaken to start a propaganda, I can not say that that is the fact; I do not know as to that. The newspapers seem to have obtained the information from some source, but they did not obtain it from the members of the commission.

Mr. HARRISON. And not from the Treasury Department?

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator read only yesterday what the Secretary of the Treasury said. He said at that time, following the statement almost exactly that is in the morning newspapers, that the commission had not met; that no proposition had been made, and that the commission had not given consideration to any proposal. I can not say but what there has been some talk; I do not know as to that; but I want to say to the Senator that the commission will decide the question of the settlement.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the article from the New York Herald which is headed "French debt pact taken up to-day." I wish to see if the New York Herald has it about right when the pact shall come here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRENCH DEBT PACT TAKEN UP TO-DAY—BOTH SIDES ARE VIRTUALLY AGREED—PAYMENTS BEGIN AT \$25,000,000, LATER REACHING \$100,000,000—HOPE ULTIMATELY TO CANCEL OBLIGATION—OPPONENTS TO SAY NATION NEVER EXPECTS TO PAY—ITALIAN AGREEMENT SAFE

By Carter Field

WASHINGTON, April 22.—With the Italian debt settlement assured of final approval within a day or two the American Debt Commission will meet to-morrow in its second attempt to reach an agreement for the settlement of the French debt. A clear-cut majority of 19 in the Senate in favor of the Italian settlement stood to-day unswerving, while Senator REED of Missouri and Senator HOWELL, of Nebraska, urged reconsideration of the vote by which yesterday the Upper House voiced its approval of the terms granted Italy.

So confident is official Washington that the American Debt Commission will reach an agreement with Ambassador Berenger as to terms of the settlement of the French debt that no surprise would be occasioned if the negotiations should be concluded within a few days. The preliminary negotiations, it is understood here, have gone so far that little in dispute remains to be settled.

EXPECT CANCELLATION LATER

It is known that the terms on which the French ambassador has agreed with individual members of the debt commission contemplates payments beginning at \$25,000,000 annually and gradually extending up to \$100,000,000 annually. It is known also that the willingness of the French to agree to such heavy payments later on is based to a considerable extent on the belief that these payments will never have to be made. They are confident that this country will have a change of heart which will result in a forgiving of the debt long before the payments have reached their peak.

So generally is this understood that it is fairly certain that when the agreement comes up for debate in the House and Senate, following the course of the Italian settlement still under discussion, it will be frankly attacked on this phase.

The first meeting will be held just prior to the meeting to-morrow of the Cabinet. This, it is understood, is to permit a formal report to the President by the debt commission. Mr. Coolidge, of course, is perfectly advised as to what has been going on, but this will be the official presentation of the terms of the offer which Mr. Berenger will make in the morning. It is expected another meeting of the Debt Commission will be held in the afternoon.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question in reference to the article in the New York Herald which bears the headline:

French debt pact taken up to-day. Both sides are virtually agreed. Payments begin at \$25,000,000, later reaching \$100,000,000. Hope ultimately to cancel obligation.

I understand the Senator to say that the information in the article may have been given out by the French?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but I do not say that positively. That, however, is the only source from which it could come, in my opinion. I may say that I also should like to have the article go into the RECORD, and then let the debt settlement as finally arrived at, if we can reach a settlement—and I do not know that we can; but if we can reach a settlement—let us see whether the information is correct or not.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, assuming that it came from French sources, does not the Senator think, in view of past experience, that the newspapers are warranted in drawing the conclusion that that will be the settlement?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is, we were going to take whatever we were offered?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; that has not been the case in any settlement which we have made. The newspapers never knew what the settlements were until the settlements were announced by both countries involved. I wish to say—and the press will bear me out in that—that we gave no news out until the final settlement, and when the final settlement was made, America and the country with which America settled were informed at the same time of the exact terms. There has been more published before ever the commission met in regard to the French debt settlement than in regard to all the other settlements combined.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Now, Mr. President, while the Senator from Nebraska is not here—and I understand he is on the way—

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will yield to me, out of order I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which I have prepared which shows the manner in which the \$100,000,000 authorized by the public buildings bill will be apportioned, based on the 1920 census, as proposed by the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The table referred to is as follows:

Approximate figures showing manner in which one hundred million-dollar appropriation for public buildings would be apportioned, based on 1920 census, as proposed by amendment of Senator McKellar

Name	Population	Amount
Alabama	2,348,174	\$2,223,000
Arizona	334,162	316,000
Arkansas	1,752,204	1,659,000
California	3,426,861	3,245,000
Colorado	939,629	889,000
Connecticut	1,380,631	1,307,000
Delaware	223,003	211,000
Florida	958,470	917,000
Georgia	2,895,832	2,743,000
Idaho	431,066	408,000
Illinois	6,485,280	6,144,000
Indiana	2,930,390	2,775,000
Iowa	2,404,021	2,276,000
Kansas	1,769,237	1,675,000
Kentucky	2,416,630	2,298,000
Louisiana	1,798,599	1,703,000
Maine	768,014	727,000
Maryland	1,449,661	1,373,000
Massachusetts	3,852,356	3,648,000
Michigan	3,668,412	3,475,000
Minnesota	2,387,125	2,260,000
Mississippi	1,790,618	1,696,000
Missouri	3,404,055	3,223,000
Montana	548,889	519,000
Nebraska	1,296,372	1,228,000
Nevada	77,407	73,000
New Hampshire	443,083	419,000
New Jersey	3,155,900	2,990,000
New Mexico	360,350	340,000
New York	10,389,227	9,841,000
North Carolina	2,659,223	2,423,000
North Dakota	646,872	612,000
Ohio	5,759,394	5,457,000
Oklahoma	2,028,283	1,920,000
Oregon	783,389	742,000
Pennsylvania	8,720,017	8,262,000
Rhode Island	604,397	572,000
South Carolina	1,683,724	1,594,000
South Dakota	636,547	602,000
Tennessee	2,337,885	2,214,000
Texas	4,663,228	4,418,000
Utah	449,396	425,000
Vermont	332,428	332,000
Virginia	2,309,187	2,186,000
Washington	1,356,621	1,285,000
West Virginia	1,463,701	1,386,000
Wisconsin	2,632,067	2,492,000
Wyoming	194,402	183,000
Alaska	55,036	52,000
Hawaii	225,912	242,000
Philippine Islands	10,314,310	100,000,000
Porto Rico	11,299,809	

† Not included in above figures but would probably be included in apportionment under amendment.

DUPLICATE CHECK FOR STATE TREASURER OF OHIO

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator from Ohio has asked me to yield to him.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up Order of Business 634, Senate bill 2741, for the relief of the State of Ohio. If it leads to any debate, I will withdraw it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. What is the nature of the bill?

Mr. FESS. The basis of the bill is that a check was issued—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Chief Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3646, as amended, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, the disbursing clerk of the Department of Agriculture is authorized and directed to issue, without the requirement of an indemnity bond, a duplicate of original check numbered 968745, drawn October 1, 1923, in favor of "State treasurer of Ohio" for \$29,812.78, and lost, stolen, or miscarried in the mails.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not fond of this practice in any event. This evidently is taking out of the Treasury,

through the Department of Agriculture, a sum of money to be paid over to the State of Ohio.

Mr. FESS. No.

Mr. McNARY. At all events, it is a matter of great importance, and I do not think it ought to be taken up in this way. I desire to look into it.

Mr. FESS. I withdraw it, then, Mr. President.

CHARLES M. RODEFER

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. Some time ago the Senate passed a bill in the case of Charles M. Rodefer, of Ohio, who had lost a bond. Subsequently the House passed a similar bill. The bills crossed each other on the way. The House bill is now on the calendar as Order of Business No. 650. Inasmuch as the Senate has already passed an identical bill, I ask that this bill be taken up now. It is House bill 2009.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether the bill contains the usual provision for indemnification.

Mr. WILLIS. Yes; I will say to the Senator that it does. It is identical with the bill that we passed.

Mr. KING. What is the amount involved?

Mr. WILLIS. I think it is \$20,000—double the amount of the principal and accrued interest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The secretary will read the bill.

The Chief Clerk read the bill (H. R. 2009) for the relief of Charles M. Rodefer, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to redeem in favor of Charles M. Rodefer United States Treasury certificate of indebtedness No. 11227 in the denomination of \$10,000, dated September 15, 1919, matured September 15, 1920, series T-10, with interest from March 15, 1920, to September 15, 1920, at the rate of 4½ per cent per annum, without presentation of the said certificate or the coupon representing interest thereon from March 15, 1920, to September 15, 1920, the certificate having been lost, stolen, or destroyed: Provided, That said certificate of indebtedness shall not have been previously presented and paid, and that payment shall not be made hereunder for any coupon which shall have been previously presented and paid: And provided further, That said Charles M. Rodefer shall first file in the Treasury Department of the United States a bond in the penal sum of double the amount of the principal of the said certificate of indebtedness and the interest which had accrued when the principal became due and payable in such form and with such sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of the lost, stolen, or destroyed certificate of indebtedness and coupon hereinbefore described.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

ITALIAN DEBT SETTLEMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. REED of Missouri to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H. R. 6773) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Kingdom of Italy to the United States of America was passed.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] having arrived, I merely want to state one point with relation to the motion to reconsider. I have forgotten whether or not I entered the motion to reconsider on yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was entered yesterday.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I think I did make the motion. If I can have the attention of the Senate for just a moment, I will state one point. The Senator from Nebraska has other propositions.

The British debt settlement with Italy provides:

3. The payments due under all bonds issued in accordance with this agreement shall be made without deduction for and shall be exempt from any and all taxes and other public dues, present or future, imposed by or under authority of Italy or any political or local taxing authority within Italy.

That means, therefore, that if Great Britain were to sell her bonds to any person in the world, whether resident of Italy or nonresident, the bonds would be free from taxation by Italy.

When we come to the American debt settlement we find this proposition:

The principal and interest of all bonds issued or to be issued hereunder shall be paid without deduction for, and shall be exempt from, any and all taxes or public dues, present or future, imposed by or

under authority of Italy, or any political or local taxing authority within Italy—

Thus far the language is practically identical; but this follows—

whenever, so long as, and to the extent that beneficial ownership is in (a) the Government of the United States; (b) a person, firm, or association neither domiciled nor ordinarily resident in Italy; or (c) a corporation not organized under the laws of Italy.

In other words, and in simpler language, under the British debt settlement the bonds which Great Britain receives from Italy are nontaxable by Italy, absolutely and without qualification. Under the American debt settlement the bonds are not taxable if owned by the United States or if owned by a person, firm, or association not domiciled or ordinarily resident in Italy, or a corporation not organized under the laws of Italy. So that the Italian market for bonds which America holds or may receive is closed to these Italian bonds, because the Italian who desires to invest in bonds of Italy issued under these debt settlements will buy the British bonds, because he can hold them free from taxation by Italy.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. When I finish this statement. The bonds issued to America, should we desire to negotiate them, can not be sold in Italy, because the Italian Government would immediately tax those bonds, or would have the right immediately to tax them. The effect is to deny a market for these Italian bonds in the very place where the best market presumptively exists.

I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I should like to have the Senator's thought on this phase of the matter. It occurs to me that the explanation of the difference lies in the fact that the American-Italian agreement provides for conversion into small bonds which will be salable on the market, while the British-Italian agreement does not so provide. The bonds which are to be issued by Italy for Great Britain are bonds of four and one-half million pounds apiece, which, of course, are not available for negotiation on the ordinary market. It occurred to me that that was the reason for the difference in those provisions.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, why does not the Senator also add that those bonds are not to be cut up, but are to be bonds of \$22,500,000 each, and they do not bear any interest; it is an annuity plan, whereas the American plan is a bond plan, the bonds drawing interest. I want to say to the Senator further that every settlement we have made uses exactly the same language that is used in this one.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator will have to quote a better precedent than the previous settlements his commission has put over in order to make a convincing argument so far as I am concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I did not state that as an argument. I stated it as a fact. The argument has already been stated, I think; and it shows conclusively that the two are entirely different. One is an annuity settlement, and the other is a bond settlement.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will not the Senator first give us his thought—

Mr. REED of Missouri. When all the Senators get through I will answer all of them. Is the Senator from Pennsylvania through?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am through.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Now let us see what these interjections and objections mean when boiled down: First, that we made some other settlement, and providently failed to provide that the bonds which we receive shall be exempt from taxation by the Government issuing the bonds.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that when I speak on the subject I will tell the reason why.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not care what the reason is. There is no reason for that—

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; there is.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Except yielding to the importunities of debtors who are repudiating their obligations to the United States of America. Now we are told that there is no clause in the British debt settlement providing for taxation of Italy's bonds to Great Britain because the settlement is in the form of an annuity, and that the British debt bears no interest.

To my mind the argument to be drawn from the facts stated is entirely against this proposition; for if Great Britain is to receive an annuity and that is exempted from taxation, then if we receive our pay in the form of interest, which is, after all, an annuity paid upon money, a payment based upon a debt, I want to know why it should not also be exempted. The mere

form makes no difference; but let us see the absurdity of this settlement, the outrage of this settlement.

We get from Italy one-eighth of 1 per cent interest in the early days of this settlement, and we propose to say then to the Italian who will buy an Italian bond, "Italy can tax you on that bond." Everybody knows that if they levy a tax at all it will be greater than one-eighth of 1 per cent; so that by simply levying a tax of one-eighth of 1 per cent during the early days of the period of this loan Italy can absolutely destroy any market for these obligations in the Kingdom of Italy.

What an absurdity it is to say to a Government, "We are going to settle with you for about 23 cents on the dollar. We are going to take your bonds, and then we are going to permit you to tax those bonds the moment they come into the possession of a citizen of Italy."

If we should transmute these bonds, as it is provided we may, into a merchantable security, and then conclude that we wanted to sell them on the market for what we could get, for what they really would figure out to be worth, which at the outside is about 23 cents on a dollar, we would naturally look for that market among the Italian investors; we would naturally go to the country that had issued the bonds to find the market at least for a part of those bonds. But no Italian with an ounce of sense would buy that sort of obligation, knowing that it might be taxed by his Government much more than the interest he would receive.

We exempt our own bonds very largely from taxation. Some of them are totally exempt from taxation, and because they are totally exempt from taxation the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent bond has been above par practically ever since it was issued. Because there is a cloud of possible taxation as to a limited amount of $4\frac{1}{4}$ per cent bonds, some of them have recently been below par. In making this settlement with Italy, in making these concessions which amount to a gift, to a cancellation of three-quarters of the Italian debt, it is proposed to allow Italy to have the power to levy a tax upon these obligations, which will destroy their value entirely if they ever come into the possession of a citizen or a subject of the Kingdom of Italy.

Mr. President, that can not be justified. It is an improvident and indefensible thing. Whether Senators here were willing to vote for the Italian settlement or not, they certainly ought to be willing to insist that Italy shall waive the right to tax these bonds or their proceeds at any time or at any place, by whomsoever held.

I am utterly unable to understand how any such clause as this should ever have been inserted in this bill. Those Senators who voted for the Italian debt settlement did it undoubtedly for one of two reasons. They were obsessed with the idea that we must be generous to Europe; that the United States must act as general wet nurse for the world; that we must drain our own coffers for the purpose of conferring benefactions; or they voted for this measure upon the theory that this is the best settlement we could get, the best settlement because it is said Italy can not presently pay a larger sum. How can that argument be applied to the question I am now discussing? For certainly Italy can waive the right to tax these bonds at any time or at any place, and by whomsoever held.

The more I contemplate this settlement, the more infamous it seems to me. Since the vote was taken, I have been reflecting upon some circumstances that have come to my attention in the past. I remember that the first cry that was raised for the cancellation of the European indebtedness came from the banking houses that had negotiated enormous loans to Europe during, preceding, and subsequent to the war. I recall that this was the situation then: The representatives of the great banking house of Morgan, that institution having been the fiscal agent for the European countries engaged in the war, outside of Germany, and for Germany at one time, not a fiscal agent, but certainly a fiscal agency, raised the cry that we should cancel our debts. But never once did any one of those gentlemen propose that the debts to their institution should be canceled. They proposed the cancellation of the debt due the American people—the farmer, the mechanic, the laborer, the washwoman—due them because we had agreed with them that we would collect the money from Europe to pay the bonds they had bled themselves white to buy.

I remember that it was these financial institutions which consistently insisted upon the cancellation of the entire debt to the American people, not due this commission, not due these Members of Congress, but due to the American people. Yet every one of those gentlemen was insisting upon the payment of the money due them on the bonds they had taken from Europe under circumstances substantially similar to and substantially coincident with, in point of time, the loan of the moneys we advanced as a Government.

I am not unmindful of the fact that every one of these institutions and every man connected with them, every spokesman they have had, has been insisting ever since that if they can not get a total cancellation, they shall have a partial cancellation, and we are now confronted with the fact that it is proposed to cancel three-fourths of the Italian debt.

Gentlemen may undertake to cover it by technical phraseology; they may say that they are to pay the entire debt, and that they have only reduced the rate of interest. But, sir, everybody but a fool knows that when you extend the debt for 62 years and fix a total annual payment on the average of 1.1 per cent, you have to all intents and purposes canceled three-quarters of that debt.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I have agreed to yield to the Senator from Iowa to call a quorum, because the managers of the House in the impeachment case will be here at 1 o'clock. I shall continue my remarks later.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ferris	King	Sackett
Bayard	Fess	La Follette	Sheppard
Bingham	Frazier	McKellar	Shipstead
Blease	George	McKinley	Shortridge
Borah	Gerry	McLean	Smoot
Bratton	Goff	McMaster	Stanfield
Broussard	Gooding	McNary	Steck
Bruce	Hale	Mayfield	Stephens
Cameron	Harrell	Neely	Swanson
Copeland	Harris	Nye	Trammell
Couzens	Harrison	Oddie	Tyson
Cummins	Hefflin	Overman	Wadsworth
Curtis	Howell	Pepper	Warren
Dale	Johnson	Phipps	Watson
Deneen	Jones, N. Mex.	Pine	Wheeler
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Williams
Edge	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.	Willis
Fernald	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] on account of illness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

IMPEACHMENT OF JUDGE GEORGE W. ENGLISH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Senate, under its order, will proceed to the consideration of the articles of impeachment of George W. English, United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], chairman of the Judiciary Committee, may administer the oath to the President of the Senate as the Presiding Officer of the court.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa will present himself at the Vice President's desk.

Mr. CUMMINS advanced to the Vice President's desk and administered the oath to the Vice President as follows:

You do solemnly swear that in all things appertaining to the trial of the impeachment of George W. English, United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois, now pending, you will do impartial justice according to the Constitution and laws. So help you God.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll, and as their names are called Senators will present themselves at the desk in groups of 10 and the oath will be administered to them.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, a large number of Senators are absent. Some arrangement ought to be made with reference to administering the oath to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the precedents of the Senate each Senator who has not been sworn will be called to the desk when he enters the Chamber and the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well; if that is the rule.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Messrs. ASHURST, BAYARD, BINGHAM, BLEASE, BORAH, BRATTON, BROUSSARD, BRUCE, BUTLER, CAMERON, CAPPER, CARAWAY, COPELAND, COUZENS, and CUMMINS, and these Senators, with the exception of Mr. BLEASE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. CARAWAY, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I noticed that, when the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] was

called, he shook his head to indicate that he would not take the oath. On yesterday the Senator from South Carolina asked to be excused from participating in the trial of Judge English and gave as his reason for so doing the relationship which exists between himself and one of the board of managers of the House, Representative DOMINICK. We all sympathize with the views expressed by the Senator from South Carolina; but in the composition of the Senate as a court to try Judge English on the indictment which has been returned here by the House of Representatives, I think no one may be excused from taking the oath.

What shall happen to the Senator from South Carolina when it becomes necessary to vote is an entirely different matter, but the rule specifically provides that all the Members of the Senate who are present shall present themselves and take the oath, and that absent Senators shall take the oath as they appear in the Senate. I therefore think it not competent for us to excuse the Senator from South Carolina from taking the oath as a member of the court. I hope the question will not be raised and that we shall avoid any technicality which might be urged at any time. I ask the Senator from South Carolina to take the oath.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Messrs. CURTIS, DALE, DENEEN, DILL, DU PONT, EDGE, EDWARDS, ERNST, FERNALD, FERRIS, FESS, FLETCHER, FRAZIER, GEORGE, and GERRY, and these Senators, with the exception of Mr. DU PONT, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ERNST, Mr. FERRIS, and Mr. FLETCHER, appeared and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

Mr. HEFLIN. I desire to announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS] is unavoidably absent from the Chamber.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] from the Senate.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Messrs. GILLETT, GLASS, GOFF, GOODING, GREENE, HALE, HARRELD, HARRIS, HARRISON, HEFLIN, HOWELL, and JOHNSON, and these Senators, with the exception of Mr. GILLETT, Mr. GLASS, and Mr. GREENE, appeared, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Messrs. JONES of New Mexico, JONES of Washington, KENDRICK, KEYES, KING, LA FOLLETTE, LENROOT, MCKELLAR, MCKINLEY, MCLEAN, and MCMASTER, and these Senators, with the exception of Mr. LENROOT, appeared, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Messrs. McNARY, MAYFIELD, MEANS, METCALF, MOSES, NEELY, NORBECK, NORRIS, NYE, ODDIE, OVERMAN, PEPPER, PHIPPS, PINE, PITTMAN, and RANSDELL, and these Senators, with the exception of Mr. MEANS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSES, Mr. NORBECK, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. PITTMAN, appeared, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Messrs. REED of Missouri, REED of Pennsylvania, ROBINSON of Arkansas, ROBINSON of Indiana, SACKETT, SCHALL, SHEPPARD, SHIPSTEAD, SHORTRIDGE, SIMMONS, SMITH, SMOOT, STANFIELD, STECK, and STEPHENS, and these Senators, with the exception of Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas, Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana, Mr. SCHALL, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. SMITH, appeared, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Messrs. BLEASE, SWANSON, TRAMMELL, TYSON, UNDERWOOD, WADSWORTH, WALSH, WARREN, WATSON, WELLER, WHEELER, WILLIAMS, and WILLIS, and these Senators, with the exception of Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WELLER, appeared, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

Mr. HEFLIN. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is absent on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This completes the administration of the oath to the Senators present. Absent Senators will be sworn as they enter the Chamber.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I submit the order which I send to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the order submitted by the Senator from Iowa.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Secretary notify the House of Representatives that the Senate is now organized for the trial of articles of impeachment against George W. English, district judge of the United States for the eastern district of Illinois, and is ready to receive the managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senators, I desire to say that all that remains to be done at present is to fix a time at which the summons shall be re-

turnable. It has been the custom heretofore not to fix that time until the managers on the part of the House are present. It will probably require 10 or 15 minutes to secure the presence of the managers, and there will be nothing to be done, so far as the impeachment is concerned, until they shall be present.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Iowa a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. Has the Senator in mind a time when he thinks the trial should proceed?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes; I have. I have prepared an order, which I intend to submit to the Senate. It provides for the appearance of the respondent or defendant on the 3d day of May.

Mr. WATSON. Is the trial then to proceed?

Mr. CUMMINS. That will be entirely as determined by the Senate at that time, but the usual order is that the defendant will appear, and he may ask time to file an answer. Undoubtedly a reasonable time will be granted to him to file an answer. The managers on the part of the House of Representatives will then desire to file a replication. Just how long a time they will think necessary in order to prepare it, I do not know, but it will undoubtedly be only a short time.

I am informed, but entirely unofficially, that the defendant may be ready to file his answer at the end of the 10 days which are given him by this order for appearance.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to an inquiry?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. Has the Senator from Iowa made an examination and reached a conclusion as to whether the Senate could be called in extraordinary session to try this impeachment, or whether it is required that both the House of Representatives and the Senate shall be in session if the impeachment is to be heard and disposed of?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes. Certain members of the Judiciary Committee, of which I happen to be chairman, have made rather an exhaustive study of that subject. I think it is the opinion of all the members of the Judiciary Committee who have examined the matter that the House can adjourn sine die, with the consent, of course, of the Senate, and that the impeachment proceedings can go forward without the presence of the House of Representatives; although I say, very frankly, that the only precedent with regard to that question was decided the other way. That precedent was in the impeachment of Secretary Belknap. It was then ruled by the Senate that the House of Representatives must be present during the impeachment trial.

Mr. SWANSON. Then, as I understand, the conclusion that has been reached by the members of the Judiciary Committee who have made an investigation of the subject is that the Senate could continue its present session and consent, under the Constitution, for the House to adjourn sine die, and that then this case could be tried by the Senate remaining in session?

Mr. CUMMINS. That is one of the possibilities.

Mr. SWANSON. Has the question been investigated and a conclusion reached as to whether both the House of Representatives and the Senate could adjourn sine die and the Senate could be called back into extraordinary session to try the impeachment?

Mr. CUMMINS. We are of the opinion, when the time comes to settle it, if it is desired to postpone the trial of the impeachment case until some time in the fall, that then the House and Senate ought to agree to adjourn to that time. My own opinion is that the President can not call the Senate in session for the purpose of trying an impeachment case; but that is simply my own opinion. The matter has not been considered by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SWANSON. A cursory examination led me to reach the same conclusion; but I could see no objection, as suggested by the Senator, to consent, under the Constitution, for the House to adjourn sine die and the Senate continue in session to try the impeachment. There is no doubt about that, is there?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the better opinion is that that can be done if the Senate desires to do it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I hope that all Members of the Senate, and particularly the lawyers of the Senate, will give consideration to that matter before we finally determine it. I think it is a very doubtful proposition, and some very eminent lawyers of the past have expressed that view. There may be sound arguments in favor of the proposition that the

House may adjourn; but I think it is very doubtful whether the House can have managers here conducting an impeachment after the House shall have disappeared.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, there is no gainsaying the fact that there has been difference of opinion upon that question; it has been very learnedly argued on both sides in the history of impeachments and in the history of the Constitution; but we are not called upon at the present time to determine that. The question will not arise until the issues in the case have been settled; then it will become necessary for the Senate to determine at what time the trial shall proceed.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that the time when the Senate should proceed would depend to a great extent upon what authority we have to act separately, with the House in adjournment and the Senate in session. The reason why I made the suggestion at this time was so that the experienced and able lawyers on the Judiciary Committee could make a thorough investigation and let the Senate know what its rights were without imperiling its decision in this matter as finally reached.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is a very interesting question and admits of considerable argument.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I understand that the chairman of the committee has appointed a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary to examine and determine that question. Is that not so?

Mr. CUMMINS. Without any order on the part of the Senate, I appointed a committee—a subcommittee it may be called—of the Judiciary Committee to study and consider that subject.

Mr. CURTIS. I so understood.

Mr. CUMMINS. And the majority of the committee, so far as I know, without any dissent, although they were not all present when the final conclusion was reached, held that it was not necessary for the House to be present or in session during the trial of the impeachment.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. NEELY. Since the only precedent on the subject is contrary to the conclusion reached by the subcommittee, upon what authority is the conclusion based?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will endeavor to explain it. In the Belknap case the question arose whether it was necessary for the House to be in session during the trial of the impeachment, and it was ruled in that case that the House must remain in session. I think everybody recognizes that there were very peculiar circumstances surrounding the trial of the impeachment of Secretary Belknap. There were political considerations, which I have no doubt had great weight in the determination of the matter. There are, I think, 12 precedents in the various States with constitutions substantially like our own.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator may suggest that one of the considerations urged by some who took this view in the Belknap case was that without the House being in session it would be difficult, perhaps, to maintain a quorum of the Senate, and some therefore urged as one of the reasons why the House ought to be in session that thereby the maintenance of a quorum in the Senate would be facilitated.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is true, but the chief consideration was this: It was alleged that certain of the Senators did not want to try the Belknap case until after November elections. That did not appear, of course, in the ruling; but, at any rate, that was one of the material things that developed in that case. There was a controversy in respect to the time at which the case should be tried. Some wanted to put it over until after the elections and some wanted to try it before the elections.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, does the Senator believe that the precedent in the Belknap case was established as a matter of political expediency?

Mr. CUMMINS. At least the subcommittee was of the opinion that political considerations had very considerable influence in reaching that decision.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator might add that the vote of the Senate in the Belknap impeachment on the question we are now discussing was a very close one.

Mr. CUMMINS. A very close vote. I think the vote was 19 and 17, but there were not more than 2 votes either way.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. SWANSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CUMMINS. Allow me to finish answering the inquiry that was made as to the precedents. There are half a dozen or more precedents in the States in which it has been uni-

formly held that the senate could go forward in the trial of an impeachment case without the presence of the house.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. I understood the Senator to reach the conclusion that the Senate could consent to the House adjourning sine die and continue in session and try the impeachment.

Mr. CUMMINS. I said that is the conclusion we reached.

Mr. SWANSON. If that conclusion was reached, that was under the idea that the Senate could consent for the House to adjourn more than three days under the clause of the Constitution providing for such an adjournment?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Constitution says that neither House shall adjourn for more than three days without the consent of the other.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like, however, to have the Senator consider this matter: The clause in the Constitution reads as follows:

Neither House, during the session of Congress, shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days.

That implies a session of Congress, not a session of the Senate. It seems to me that when we consent to the adjournment of the House it is no longer a session of Congress. The question would be whether we could give consent for them to adjourn sine die. When the House adjourns sine die, that really means a termination of the session of Congress, it seems to me, because "Congress" means both Houses in session.

Mr. CUMMINS. That point was urged very strongly in our consideration of the matter, and it was believed by the greater number of the members of the committee that if we did not want to try this case at the present time or after our legislative work had been finished, we should then agree upon an adjournment of both the House and the Senate until, say, the middle of November, and reassemble and try the case before the regular session opens in December.

Mr. SWANSON. There would be no question about its being legal if the Senate should consent for the House to adjourn for three weeks and then come back and adjourn sine die when the Senate had completed the trial of the impeachment, would there?

Mr. CUMMINS. There would not be any question about that.

Mr. SWANSON. There would be no question that the Senate could consent that the House should adjourn for three weeks or four weeks and then come back for an adjournment sine die. There would be no question about that procedure being legal, would there?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has just suggested that he has very grave doubts whether the Senate can proceed with the impeachment at all without the constant presence of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understood, he said the Senate could not proceed when there was no House here; but the House could adjourn or recess. They would not have to be in session every day when we were here. It seems to me they could take a recess or adjourn for a month as well as they could for one day. If the reverse were true, they would have to sit there continuously while we sat here.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator must remember that I do not agree with the Senator from Idaho. I think we have the authority to do just what has been suggested by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. It seems to me there can be no question about it. We could consent for the House to adjourn for three weeks or a month, and we could proceed to try this case, and then let the House come back for an adjournment sine die. In that event Congress would still be in session, because neither House would have adjourned sine die.

Mr. CUMMINS. One of our difficulties is this; and this is a view that is held, I think, by all of the Senators: We have a great deal of important legislative work to do. There is a notion around the Capitol that we could adjourn or finish our legislative work by the middle of May or by the first of June. I do not share that view of the matter. I think it will take Congress until the middle of June to conclude reasonably and decently the legislative work that it must perform and ought to perform before we enter upon the trial.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. BLEASE. If the House were to stay in session, and just let the Members who are here go into the Chamber and call the House together each day at 12 o'clock, and then adjourn for the want of a quorum day by day, and in that way virtually keep the House in session, does the Senator think that would be sufficient?

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course, often in the past there has been a gentlemen's agreement among the Members of the House by which they adjourned three days at a time, with the understanding that there would be no quorum called for. Just what the House would want to do in that respect I do not know.

Mr. BLEASE. It seems to me that would obviate the objection of the Senator from Idaho, because then the House would really be in session all the time.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is true.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. RANDELL. Is there any doubt about the right of Judge English to continue to perform the duties of his office until he is tried?

Mr. CUMMINS. None whatever.

Mr. RANDELL. There is not in my mind. The question was raised, I will state to the Senator, and I thought there was no doubt about it; but I wished to ask the Senator's opinion upon it.

Mr. CUMMINS. He will continue to discharge his duties as judge until after the trial of the impeachment.

Mr. RANDELL. I agree with that view.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that the only way in which this question can be raised, the only test that could be applied to the propriety and to the conclusiveness of our action, would be in the event of a conviction of Judge English?

Mr. CUMMINS. I can conceive no other way in which to raise the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If he should be convicted, then the only question that would arise would be whether or not he would yield peaceably his seat as a judge of the district court for the eastern district of Illinois. What court could pass upon the conclusiveness of the action of this body and the House of Representatives if it had been agreed between them that this was the proper and conclusive method of dealing with this subject?

Mr. CUMMINS. Personally, I have not examined that question. I doubt very much whether Judge English, if convicted and removed from office, could raise that question at all anywhere.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no court to which he could go that is supreme to this court, is there?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; that is true.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, has the Senator from Iowa sufficient information to enable him to estimate with any degree of accuracy how long it will take to dispose of this impeachment case?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have made some inquiry about that, and it is estimated that it will take from two to three weeks.

At 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m. the managers of the impeachment on the part of the House of Representatives appeared at the bar, and their presence was announced by the Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will conduct the managers to the seats provided for them.

The managers were conducted to the seats assigned to them in the area in front of the Secretary's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen managers, the Senate is now organized for the trial of the impeachment of George W. English, United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I present the order which I send to the desk and ask that it be read, and further ask for its immediate consideration. In this connection I desire to say that it has been customary in former impeachment trials for the Presiding Officer to ask the managers on the part of the House whether the order I am about to suggest is satisfactory to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That a summons be issued, as required by the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate when sitting for the trial of the impeachment of George W. English, district judge of the United States for the eastern district of Illinois, returnable on the 3d day of May, 1926, at 12.30 p. m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen managers, is the order satisfactory to the managers on the part of the House?

Mr. Manager MICHENER. Mr. President, I am directed by the managers on the part of the House to say to the Senate

that the order proposed by the Senator from Iowa is agreeable to the managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the order.

The order was agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate sitting for the trial of the impeachment adjourn until May 3, at 12.30 p. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate sitting for the trial of the impeachment adjourned until Monday, May 3, 1926, at 12.30 o'clock p. m.

The managers on the part of the House withdrew from the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will return to legislative session.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently said: The Chair would suggest that the Senators who are present and who have not been sworn in the matter of the impeachment of Judge George W. English present themselves at the desk and receive the oath.

Mr. LENROOT, Mr. GILLET, Mr. WELLER, Mr. NORBECK, and Mr. FERRIS advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the Vice President administered to them the following oath:

You do, each of you, solemnly swear that in all things appertaining to the trial of the impeachment of George W. English, district judge of the eastern district of Illinois, now pending, you will do impartial justice, according to the Constitution and laws. So help you God.

ITALIAN DEBT SETTLEMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. REED of Missouri to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H. R. 6773) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Kingdom of Italy to the United States of America was passed.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	King	Reed, Pa.
Bayard	Frazier	La Follette	Sackett
Bingham	George	Lenroot	Sheppard
Blease	Gerry	McKellar	Shipstead
Borah	Gillett	McKinley	Smoot
Bratton	Goff	McLean	Stanfield
Broussard	Gooding	McMaster	Steck
Bruce	Greene	McNary	Stephens
Cameron	Hale	Mayfield	Swanson
Copeland	Harrell	Neely	Trammell
Couzens	Harris	Norbeck	Tyson
Cummins	Harrison	Nye	Wadsworth
Curtis	Hedin	Oddie	Warren
Dale	Howell	Overman	Watson
Deneen	Johnson	Pepper	Weller
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelps	Wheeler
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Williams
Fernald	Kendrick	Ransdell	Willis
Ferris	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Seventy-five Senators having answered the roll call, there is a quorum present.

Mr. HOWELL obtained the floor.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, may we not have order in the galleries? The Senator from Nebraska is about to make a very interesting address, and I think we ought to have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries must preserve order.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, under the provisions of the Italian debt settlement it is stipulated that some \$2,400,000,000 shall be paid over a period of 62 years, and the payments to be made are represented by 62 bonds, varying in amount from \$5,000,000 to \$79,400,000. These are the bonds which Italy has agreed to hand over to the United States Government when this settlement is ratified. But under Article VII of the agreement that has been recommended by our Debt Commission, Italy—

will issue to the United States at any time, * * * at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, * * * in exchange for any or all of the bonds issued thereunder * * * definitive engraved bonds in form suitable for sale to the public, in such amounts and denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury * * * may request, in bearer form, with provision for registration as to principal, and * * * in full registered form, and otherwise on the same terms and conditions, as to dates of issue and maturity, rate or rates of interest, if any, exemption from taxes, * * * and the like, as the bonds surrendered on such exchange. * * * Italy agrees * * * also that it will cause to be promulgated all such rules, regulations, and orders as shall be deemed necessary or desirable by the Secretary of the Treasury * * * in order to facilitate the sale of the bonds in the United States, in Italy, or else-

where, and that if requested by the Secretary of the Treasury * * * it will use its good offices to secure the listing of the bonds on such stock exchanges as the Secretary of the Treasury may specify.

Mr. President, I commend the Debt Commission upon the prudence and wisdom of that provision of the settlement. It anticipated, or it was anticipated—and undoubtedly the Debt Commission had in its mind—that it would be highly desirable for the United States Government eventually to relieve the Treasury of these bonds—sell them in Italy or elsewhere, as suggested in this agreement, so that we might be clear, ultimately, of the entire matter. In other words, the 62 bonds which Italy will initially deposit were regarded as nothing but frozen assets, always undesirable from a financial point of view.

The United States Treasury is really not different from a great banking institution, and business principles should govern. We all know there is one thing a great bank looks upon with concern: That is its frozen assets. Therefore every banking institution transforms such paper into available assets if possible, so that it may be utilizable if necessary; and that is what this article 7 provides for. It is the kind of a provision the directors of a bank would insist upon in any debt settlement under similar circumstances. It is wise, it is prudent, and, as I have stated, I commend the Debt Commission upon their course in this connection.

When, however, we come to analyze article 3 of the agreement we discover that, as desirable in the interest of the United States Government as this article is, it is absolutely nullified by article 3. Article 3 provides, as I have stated, that initially Italy shall deposit with the Government of the United States 62 bonds, varying in amounts from \$5,000,000 to \$79,400,000. Then it proceeds to indicate the interest which Italy will pay upon these bonds. Italy is not to pay any interest whatever during the first five years. For the next 10 years—for the 10 years ending in 1940—a thousand dollars of these bonds will net an income of \$1.25 a year. For the next 10 years, ending in 1950, a thousand dollars of these bonds will yield \$2.50 in income per annum. For the next 10 years, \$7.50 per annum. For the next 10 years, \$10 per annum. For the last 7 years, \$20 per annum will be paid upon a thousand dollars of these bonds.

If one should buy such bonds running the entire period of 62 years, say a number of them equivalent to \$100,000, the average income from this \$100,000 investment would be less than \$650 per annum.

In view of these facts is it not evident that these bonds, even if in marketable form, would be utterly unsalable? There can be no question about this. People who make investments of this character do so for income, and the income on \$100,000 during this period would be less than \$650 a year on the average. Therefore the reason why I have stated that, wise as are the provisions of article 7, they are absolutely nullified by article 3. So far as this settlement is concerned, if it is not amended, article 7 might as well be left out of the picture. It means nothing. To that extent these provisions are discreditable to the Foreign Debt Commission. Why was article 7 inserted? Those who want to carp might urge that it was included for the purpose of misleading the public respecting the wisdom and character of the agreement. I do not hold that such is the case. I have expressed my opinion upon the floor of the Senate before respecting this settlement. I think that in some respects it was a routine job, that the commission did not give attention to these details. I can not believe that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] consciously approved the inclusion of this article with the intention that it should mean nothing.

Mr. President, whereas the Debt Commission might have proceeded differently and provided more favorable terms of payment, yet notwithstanding the arrangements made and recommended it is possible to adopt an amendment that will afford the people of the United States the benefits that might accrue from article 7 without causing Italy to pay an additional dollar in any year, without changing the payments in any way whatever.

As a consequence I have offered an amendment providing that the payments to be made by Italy shall be in nowise affected, but that the Secretary of the Treasury, as a matter of contractual right, may say to the Government of Italy, "Instead of having bonds issued at one-eighth of 1 per cent we would like to have a lesser amount of bonds issued at a higher rate of interest, which will mean the same thing to you, as you will not have to pay an additional dollar in any year or change your payments in any way." It is wholly possible to do this, and if it is done, if the amendment that I have proposed is

adopted, it might be possible to close this Italian transaction, so far as the Treasury is concerned, within the next 20 years by getting out of our hands all of these securities, something that would be, in my opinion, of tremendous advantage to the United States Government.

Mr. President, I can not imagine what objection there is to making a change of this character. It does not place a greater burden upon Italy. It does not alter her annual payments or the total of her payments. It is simply a business arrangement enabling the Government to change frozen assets into liquid assets. No board of directors of a bank would refuse upon the appeal of one of the directors to make such a change. Why should we say, "No. The Senate must sign on the dotted line." Under the law the agreement must come here for approval, but when it comes we are told that Italy will not consent to a change, that the Debt Commission opposes any change whatever. We must sign on the dotted line as here submitted, irrespective of what our views may be in connection with any details of the settlement. Section 2 of the amendment which I have offered provides for such a change, and in my opinion its adoption is a matter of really great importance.

Mr. President, I will now address myself to section 3. It was necessary for us to issue tax-free bonds or bonds largely tax free in order to raise the enormous sums we loaned during and after the war. Notwithstanding, Italy comes to us and says, "We realize that the money you loaned was secured largely from nontaxable bonds. We have had the benefit of the use of this money without paying interest during all these years. You are now preparing to cancel the debt, merely requiring us to pay 1.1 per cent interest for 62 years. We realize all this; nevertheless you must understand that any of our bonds we give you in payment of that 1.1 per cent interest are to be taxable in our country. We will not give you a bond that if owned by any one of your citizens who happens to be domiciled in Italy will be free of taxation; they will have to pay us taxes thereon. We want you to understand, moreover, that you can not sell one of our bonds in Italy free of our right to tax them. We care not that this money came from bonds nontaxable in the United States and that the people of the United States are making the sacrifices imposed by this debt settlement. You will pay taxes on our bonds if ever you bring them to the shores of Italy." That is what the taxation provision of this agreement implies. Article V provides in part:

The principal and interest on all bonds issued hereunder shall be * * * exempt from * * * all taxes * * * imposed by or under authority of Italy * * * so long as * * * and only so long as "the beneficial ownership is (a) in the Government of the United States or (b) a person, firm, or association neither domiciled nor ordinarily resident in Italy or * * * (c) a corporation not organized under the laws of Italy."

Compare this with the corresponding section in the British-Italian settlement:

The principal and interest on all bonds issued or to be issued hereunder shall be paid without deduction for and shall be exempt from any and all taxes and from public dues present or future imposed by or under authority of the Kingdom of Italy or any political or local taxing authority within the Kingdom of Italy.

There are no such reservations as there are in our settlement. It has been urged here that each British bond amounts to \$22,000,000. One of our bonds will amount to nearly \$80,000,000. The major amounts of our annual payments are deferred, are away at the other end of the scale; hence the greater portion of the bonds afforded will be above \$22,000,000. Why and how did Britain obtain this great advantage?

Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the ability and perspicacity of British statesmen. They know what they are doing. They handle their government's business just as if it were their own business. They may appear to be moved by sentiment, but when we study British history we find that wherever sentiment appeared it never really interfered. In this matter Britain knew exactly what she was doing. She insisted upon this taxation provision and got it. Our Debt Commission did not insist upon such a provision and they did not get it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. There is very little use in discussing a question with only half a dozen Senators in the Chamber. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurt	Fess	King	Reed, Pa.
Bayard	Frazier	La Follette	Sackett
Bingham	George	Lenroot	Sheppard
Blease	Gerry	McKellar	Shipstead
Borah	Gillett	McKinley	Shortridge
Bratton	Goff	McLean	Smoot
Broussard	Gooding	McMaster	Stanfield
Bruce	Greene	McNary	Stephens
Cameron	Hale	Mayfield	Swanson
Copeland	Harrell	Neely	Tammell
Couzens	Harris	Norbeck	Tyson
Cummins	Harrison	Nye	Wadsworth
Curtis	Heflin	Oddie	Warren
Dale	Howell	Overman	Watson
Deneen	Johnson	Pepper	Weller
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Wheeler
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Williams
Fernald	Kendrick	Ransdell	Willis
Ferris	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, to sum up the statements that I have previously made, article 7 of the Italian debt settlement provides that the 62 bonds issued to this Government initially by Italy, varying in amount from \$5,000,000 to about \$80,000,000, may be broken up into marketable bonds of less amounts; but under article 3 of the agreement the maximum that \$100,000 would yield during the last 7 years of the 62-year period is only \$2,000 a year, and the average for \$100,000 invested over the 62-year period is less than \$650 annually. Therefore the "marketable" bonds for which this agreement provides will be utterly unsalable.

What I propose is an amendment that will not alter a payment that is to be made by Italy; that will not increase her obligations in any way whatever; but provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may, with contractual right, ask Italy to issue a less amount of bonds at a higher rate of interest, so that we may transform frozen assets into liquid assets. In short, thus have marketable securities, if desired as provided in article 7 of the agreement but nullified by article 3 through low interest rates, varying from \$10.25 annually for a \$1,000 bond, during the first 10 years after 1930, to an income that never reaches more than \$20 per year for a \$1,000 bond, and that is only during the last 7 years of the 62-year period. The average income from a \$1,000 bond would be less than \$6.50 per year.

That is all the second section of my amendment provides for. It does not propose to increase Italy's burden. It simply gives the Secretary of the Treasury the legal right to ask for a less amount of bonds at higher rates of interest, provided Italy's payments shall not be increased in any year over and above what she has agreed to pay.

The third section added by my amendment affords us the identical provision respecting taxation that is contained in the Italian-British settlement. Mr. President, out of courtesy, the Government of Italy should agree to these changes. Otherwise the Senate is in this position, that it dare not alter this agreement in any way. Here is a proposal that is merely a business detail. It does not increase the burden of Italy but does afford the Government of the United States certain advantages which article 7 was intended to provide but which are nullified by article 3 through the stipulation of these extremely low rates of interest. Therefore it seems to me that the Senate should consider this as a matter of business. Under the provisions of the amendment I have offered it would be possible for the United States Government within 20 years to terminate this whole arrangement with Italy through the sale and distribution of these bonds. So, Mr. President, I sincerely trust that reconsideration may prevail for the purpose, at least, of adopting the amendment which I have proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Edge	Howell	Norbeck
Bayard	Fernald	Johnson	Nye
Bingham	Ferris	Jones, N. Mex.	Oddie
Blease	Fess	Jones, Wash.	Overman
Borah	Frazier	Kendrick	Pepper
Bratton	George	Keyes	Phipps
Broussard	Gerry	King	Pine
Bruce	Gillett	La Follette	Ransdell
Cameron	Goff	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.
Copeland	Gooding	McKellar	Reed, Pa.
Couzens	Greene	McKinley	Sackett
Cummins	Hale	McLean	Sheppard
Curtis	Harrell	McMaster	Shipstead
Dale	Harris	McNary	Shortridge
Deneen	Harrison	Mayfield	Smoot
Dill	Heflin	Neely	Stanfield

Stephens
Swanson
Trammell

Tyson
Wadsworth
Warren

Watson
Weller
Wheeler

Williams
Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] has presented his views in support of his amendment and I had hoped that somebody would rise to reply; but it seems that this matter is to be treated with silent contempt, I think, on the theory that the less said in defense the better; that the votes are probably here; they have been organized; they are ready to be delivered, and that appeals to reason or to fairness are utterly futile.

I want to say now to the people of the United States—not to the absent Senate, for it is largely absent—that the administration of Calvin Coolidge is as much owned by the great interests of this country and controlled by them as the subordinate of any bank in the United States is controlled by the board of directors of the institution. I am no enemy of capital, for a man who is the enemy of honest dollars honestly acquired is an enemy of the American people. I believe in the protection of every honest dollar there is in the United States. Whether the fortune be great or small, whether the institution be big or little, it is entitled to just treatment by every legislative body and by every officer of the Government; but when capital moves in and takes possession of the Government of the United States it is time for some plain speech.

There has not been a demand made, to my knowledge, by the great financial interests that has not been responded to by this administration with the same subservience, the same cringing attitude that is manifested by a well-trained setter dog when his master orders him to heel. The laws of the United States are violated by the appointment as Secretary of the Treasury of a man who is absolutely barred from that position by the plain letter of the statute, perhaps the wealthiest man in the United States to-day, who, notwithstanding the fact that the statute of the United States provides that no man engaged in trade shall occupy the position of Secretary of the Treasury, was appointed to that great position when he was a director in 68 great banks and trust companies and industrial concerns, embracing every line of human activity from the manufacture of whiskey to the manufacture of aluminum, and from membership in financial syndicates of small character to an enormous if not a controlling interest in some of the great financial institutions of the United States.

In the past we have complained frequently that great, selfish outside interests have exercised too much influence upon the officials of the Government; but in this case the interests do not stand outside exercising an influence. They have moved in and taken possession of the great office of Secretary of the Treasury; and every demand made by the great banks has been acquiesced in, and the Republican Party, with the exception of the insurgent element, has been almost to a man mustered back of all of these measures—some of them abominable, indefensible, infamous—and there are always enough Democrats over here to help out, so that I wonder what the Democratic Party exists for.

This is but one of the steps, but it is a long step, a step that needed 7-league boots to take. We borrow from the American people \$10,000,000,000. We tell the washerwoman at her tub to give of the few dollars that are but the coined sweat wrung from her labor, and to buy these bonds, and that the money will be loaned to foreign countries, and that they will pay us back dollar for dollar, interest for interest, time for time, as our bonds are conditioned. We say to the man at the forge: "Buy! Buy until you have bled yourself white; but we pledge you upon the honor of this great Republic that we will collect back the money we loan to European powers." We say to the minister of the gospel: "Draw from your small earnings a part, and buy, buy, buy, buy until it hurts"—that was the language of the hour—"and when you have bought we will collect back again, so that this great burden will not rest upon our land." We proclaimed it, sirs, in every newspaper of the land. We put it forth from every rostrum and stump. We employed in its advocacy everything from moving-picture actresses, with their charming manners, to the rough-and-ready advocate of the platform.

From the steps of this Capitol Mary Pickford, with her beautiful face and her charming words, urged the American people to buy. Banks called upon their customers to buy, and we practically resorted to coercion to compel the people to yield their hard earnings. While that was going on, and preceding it, the great financial institutions of this country were loaning their money to the European countries engaged in the war. They were loaning that money at enormous discounts and at high rates of interest. More than that, they were en-

gaged in financing manufacturing industries in this country that were selling their goods at high profits to European countries, and some of these banks were participants in those profits; and, as I said this morning in the remarks I was making when I was interrupted by the impeachment proceedings, the moment the battle flags had been furled upon the fields of France, and before our soldiers had been able once more to set foot upon their native soil, the great banks of this country, particularly the great Morgan interests, were demanding that this country should cancel the indebtedness due it from these European countries.

Why were they demanding it? Did they want these countries relieved of this debt? If so, why did they not propose to cancel their indebtedness at the same time they proposed that the country should cancel its indebtedness? They wanted the debt due this Government canceled because they knew that if the debt to us was canceled their debt then would be that much nearer payment. They wanted to exploit Europe, and they are seeking to exploit Europe to-day. In order to carry out their damnable conspiracy it was actually proposed that there should be organized a syndicate of American capitalists who would control the goods that were being sent from this country to Europe, and that a corresponding syndicate should be organized in Europe, and that that European syndicate should have the distribution of the foods and materials sent from this country by the American syndicate. Thus, one syndicate here would control the foreign market of the American people and collect its toll, and the European syndicate would levy its tribute upon the crusts that went between the white lips of the starving people of Europe; and in each case the profit would be taken down, the tribute would be exacted.

Now that that time has passed, that Europe's wounds are healing, that that money is still very necessary in Europe, these financial institutions find there a better market for their money than they can find in America. They are loaning at 7 and 7½ and 8 per cent of interest. They are taking the securities at a discount, according to the best figures I have been given, of about 10 to 15 per cent. They do not propose to cancel those securities. They propose to collect them; and in order to collect them the same gentlemen who formally demanded the entire cancellation of this debt are now demanding that we shall cancel it in part. That is all that this settlement means. It was camouflaged. There was more of an effort made to conceal it than I have ever known to be made before by any set of men representing the American Republic.

They start in blandly with a solemn agreement that Italy shall pay its debt in full. We were told on the floor of the Senate that Italy was to pay its debt in full; that there was no discount of this debt. Yet every man who has studied this proposition knows that what we are getting is one-tenth of 1 per cent of this debt, scattered over a period of 62 years. Back of this subterfuge, in silence, with motionless tongues and dumb lips, but backed by a majority already delivered, and ready to be delivered again, sit the sponsors for this infamy.

What is the pretext? Ability to pay. Ability to pay to-day, sir, does not bar Italy from agreeing not to tax the securities she gives us at this miserable discount. Her present ability to pay is not affected by the fact that in the future she shall not levy a tax greater than the interest she pays us upon these securities if they are held by an Italian citizen.

Why is this proposition being put through? Because every bank that was in favor of canceling the debt in toto wants its canceled by 75 per cent, if they can not get a hundred per cent, because these banks have rallied, through their banking houses, their allies, their confederates, their associates, in the States, who have appealed to Senators. They have not stopped there. They have appealed to the representatives of great corporations they control. Great copper corporations that are owned and controlled by these interests have appealed to Senators. Other great corporations have appealed to them, and Senators are yielding to an appeal in this matter which is the selfish appeal of great institutions that are going to put money in their purses by virtue of the votes that have been cast, and probably will be cast again.

Ability to pay! We discussed that question. What is the ability of Italy to pay? She has substantially doubled her wealth in the last 10 years of time. The onward march of her prosperity is unarrested. Her population is greater than it was before the war. What is her ability to pay? It is not always considered, but it is well to consider the fact that the power of nations to produce wealth, and of peoples to produce wealth, has multiplied in the last quarter of a century five or ten fold.

The farmer of 50 or 60 years ago, with his inadequate machinery, could cultivate but small pieces of land. He could

not get into the market without great difficulty. His productive power was limited. To-day a single farmer, with modern machinery, can produce more than could be produced by an entire family 50 years ago.

Sixty or seventy years ago a mother in her home sat laboriously at a loom, and it took her about all winter to weave the cloth to make a suit or two of clothes for the men or the children of her family. To-day one woman stands in a great factory and supervises from 20 to 30 looms that are turning out thousands of yards daily.

One factory in this country produced 85 fully equipped automobiles in one day of eight hours' work. That was almost equal, perhaps, to all of the carrying capacity of all of the wagons east of the Mississippi River 50 or 75 years ago.

Great highways are built of cement, all of them tending to reduce the cost of production and cost of carriage. The power of the people of the world to produce, I say, has been in 50 years multiplied ten or fifteen times over. So, with that power to produce is the power to create wealth.

We had at the close of the Civil War a debt of a little over \$2,000,000,000, I think. It was a greater debt per capita, measured by the power of production, than the mighty debt we owe to-day. The man who stands here and says that he can look into the future for 62 years and can say that Italy can not pay this debt in full is a false prophet, because he is making a statement he knows nothing about.

Standing on the battle line until 6,000,000 of her people had been destroyed was the great Empire of Russia, and then the spirit of the people broke. They rose in their madness and overthrew the tyrannical government of the czars. They sought to repudiate it in toto, and among other things they said they would not pay the debts of this discredited government, against which they had rebelled and which they had overthrown. Because they said that, because the new Government of the people of Russia said they would not pay the indebtedness incurred by their former masters, by the tyrants who ruled over them, by the creatures who had driven them in hordes into the snows of Siberia to perish, by the creatures who had represented to them government in the form of a Cossack, with a rifle across his saddle and a knout in his hand to be laid across their bleeding backs; because these people said they would not pay the debts of their oppressors, would not pay for the chains that had been forged for their limbs, would not pay for the scaffolds that had been erected for the execution of their fathers, would not pay the money that had been expended in lavish living and for jewels by those whose feet were upon their necks and whose swords were at their hearts—because of that, because they refused to pay, the world said Bolshevism and Russia should be repudiated and never recognized.

They came to this country to buy goods. They brought with them gold. They asked to be permitted to buy goods with the gold. They were turned away, because it was said they were a dishonest government and that they had repudiated their debts. Having done that, being in that very position to-day, we propose to permit Italy to repudiate 75 per cent of the debt she incurred when we gave her the goods and the money to save her from starvation and disaster within the last few years.

Ability to pay! The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye] introduced a resolution. It was received with a quiet, polite senatorial sneer. He proposed to apply the rule of ability to pay to the American farmer. He proposed to say to the American farmer who had borrowed money from this Government, "We will settle with you just as we have settled with Italy. We will settle on the principle of your ability to pay. We will not take your car. We will not take your cow. We will not take your brood sow. We will not take your household goods and sell them," as Uncle Sam is about to do through the farm-loan banks. "We will not foreclose upon your farm." We are not actually taking the goods, wares, and chattels yet, but we will take them on deficiency judgments undoubtedly. "We will settle with you on your ability to pay from year to year."

The resolution was received with a sneer. It would not get three votes in this body. If we are to apply the rule of ability to pay to foreign nations, rich and powerful, ambitious, gathering armies to invade other lands, holding in subjection by the power of the sword other people, why should we not apply it to the American farmer? Why should we not apply it all along the line?

There is a great railroad, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, which formed the steel link that united the East and the West. It got into financial difficulty. Its stock, I think, is worth 5 or 6 cents on the dollar. It owes a large amount of money. It has an obligation to pay 6 per cent, and we are exacting the 6 per cent, although that 6 per cent must be paid by the

shippers and travelers of the United States who move over that road, in the last analysis. Is there anybody who proposes to settle with the Milwaukee road on the principle of ability to pay?

What is this spirit that has suddenly come over the Senate of the United States, that we shall yield billions of the people's money to a foreign nation, that we shall cancel this debt, and that the debt shall be canceled for the most autocratic Government that has oppressed this earth in a half century of time?

We entered the war, so we were told, to democratize the world. We entered it, we were told, for the purpose of establishing the liberties of all peoples. We rescued Italy, I repeat, and when I say "we" I mean the Entente Allies. While it is true that there were not many American soldiers in Italy, our boys took their places in the trenches in France so the French and English soldiers could go to Italy.

I am charging nothing, and have charged nothing, against the courage of the Italian people. I have, on the other hand, always defended those people. But I did say that Bolshevism had rotted a portion of the army, and an inquiry into the facts shows it. So we established Italy upon a firm basis. We gave the world to understand, by the lips of President Wilson, by the signed conditions of the treaty of Versailles, by the negotiations that were carried on in the presence of the world, we gave all peoples to understand that when they were incorporated under a new government, their rights would be respected, their language, their religion, their customs, their liberties would be maintained. In spite of that pledge Italy took the Austrian Tyrol.

The Austrian Government as well as the population of south Tyrol, at the time of the annexation and after, frequently protested against the cession. The allied and associated powers stated in reply, at the peace conference, that though the frontiers as laid down by the treaties of peace could not be rectified, the Italian Government intended to pursue to a great extent a liberal policy toward its new subjects of German extraction with regard to their language and their cultural and economic interests.

On September 18, 1919, the Italian general in command in south Tyrol issued a proclamation in which he said that the suppression of foreign languages was not desired by the Italian Government. This assurance, as well as assurances of a similar nature, was frequently repeated.

The Italian Premier, Titoni, stated on September 27, 1919:

The peoples of other nationalities now to become our fellow countrymen should know that we entirely abhor the idea of suppressing these nationalities, and that we will respect their language and cultural institutions.

The King of Italy said at the opening of Parliament in 1919:

Our liberal tradition must show us the way. We shall most loyally respect local autonomous institutions.

Many authoritative statements of a similar kind could be mentioned. May it suffice to quote the Italian Premier, who said, 10 days after the King's speech:

We state emphatically that we acknowledge the right both of Germans as well as of Slavs to the preservation of their language and their culture.

This Italian policy, however, as laid down shortly after the conclusion of the World War, underwent a radical change with a development then inaugurated in Italian domestic affairs with the ascendancy of Fascist rule. Fascism broke all pledges given to the minority nationals in the former Austrian Tyrol at the time of its annexation. A radical program of denationalization was introduced by the dissolution of all non-Italian organizations in south Tyrol, by the seizure of German property, thereby trying to Italianize all Germanic names of families, and, above all, by radical measures in the school systems of education.

Let me refer to a few decrees issued to this effect by the Italian Government.

The *Gazetta Ufficiale* of January 15, 1926, published a royal decree of January 10, 1926, No. 17, in which, according to article 1, the families of the Province of Trieste who had German names, the origins of which were possibly Latin or Italian, were forced to change their names to their original forms under penalty of 500 to 3,000 lire. According to article 2 of this decree, every non-Italian name could be changed into an Italian name by decree of the prefect, and according to article 3 of said decree these provisions could be applied to other provinces of Italy; in other words, to the entire Austrian Tyrol.

Another royal decree of January 10, 1926, No. 16, states that the Italian nationality granted to persons owing to their option

according to the peace treaties can be revoked at any time if the national in question has been deemed unworthy of Italian nationality owing to his political attitude. It is expressly added in this decree that the revoking of Italian nationality may also lead to the seizure of his entire property.

A royal decree issued on January 26, 1926, forbids the teaching of German in the schools of the south Tyrol, a measure of the most far-reaching consequences in view of the fact that the children of that region learn nothing but German at home before they go to school.

A circular letter of November 27, 1925, addressed by the prefect of Triente to the subprefects of Bozen, Meran, Brixen, Bruneck, and Cavalese goes to show how far the measures of the Italian Government regarding denationalization go, for by this letter the prefect orders that strict vigilance be kept over all private German schools, and especially over all teachers of German extraction, empowering the prefects, in order to achieve their aims of suppression of the German language, to use militia forces for the arrest of those considered guilty.

In view of all these measures, it is interesting to see the point of view taken by Italy with regard to her own minorities, such as still exist in Yugoslavia. Italy succeeded in obtaining from Yugoslavia a policy with regard to minorities laid out in conformity with Italian wishes in that respect. By a decree of September 24, 1923, this question is settled in detail, and Yugoslavia has given the Italians in her territory all possibilities of free development and entire liberty with regard to the use of their language, their associations, and their public meetings. The Italians are given the right to have schools of their own and teach the Italian language in Yugoslavia. Thus Italy has succeeded in realizing her demands on Yugoslavia with regard to her minorities—demands which are so much in contradiction to the policy she pursues as regards German minorities in the former Austrian Tyrol, and demands which are even more in contradiction to the promise given these minorities shortly after their territories were annexed on the conclusion of peace.

Mr. President, it is said that we can not collect this debt. I say we can. But we will never collect it so long as we are represented by men who want to give it away. How will we collect it? In the first place, sir, until Italy settles this debt Italy's credit is ruined, and Italy knows it. The trouble with the French franc to-day is not the balancing of the French budget but the fact that France is holding back and declining to meet her just obligations. Every man who invests money knows that he will not loan that money to a man who has repudiated his note at the bank or who has stopped payment upon his check justly given. No such man can borrow money unless he is able to deposit collateral back of the loan. No nation can repudiate its international obligations in dollars and cents and ever hope to establish its credit, and every man who is acquainted with matters of national finance knows that.

Great Britain came and settled. I am not going to say that Great Britain did it in order to reestablish her credit, for while I have criticized Great Britain many times upon this floor, there is this about an Englishman, that he does have regard for his obligations. There is this about the British Government, that in the long run of her history, with debts constantly increasing, Great Britain nevertheless has made her obligations good. She drove, I thought, a rather hard bargain with us. We yielded in some respects in which we ought not to have yielded. Nevertheless she did agree to pay us in full and agreed to pay an interest that was not outrageous and ridiculous.

But there was another reason, of course, in every English statesman's heart. He knew that when Great Britain had settled its debt, when she had said to all the world "The British Empire keeps faith," when she had signed on the dotted line and said, "We propose to do everything that is honorable in this matter," she knew that British credit would be sustained and strengthened throughout the world.

What has been the lesson? Although Great Britain suffered terribly in the war, although she is one of few countries that has not increased her population since the war, although she has a vast amount of unemployment, nevertheless the British credit stands almost to the apex and British exchange is equal in value of exchange to the dollar and rapidly crowding us for first position. Great Britain, if she ever again engages in a war and needs to borrow money, can on the credit of a faith well maintained come to America or go anywhere in the world and borrow that money. But will Italy ever be allowed to borrow any money in this country if she makes this settlement? Not while this generation lives, not while the memory of this infamy exists, not until repudiation has become a matter of honor and refusal to pay is certificate of honesty.

France must pay her debt. If we stand fast before she makes that settlement, I say to the Senator from Utah that if France says she can not pay, ask her to turn over to America the islands in the West Indies which command the control of the Panama Canal, islands that are of no financial benefit to her, but are of infinite value to us as a matter of defense. The credit of France is ruined, because France has repudiated up to this time to all intents and purposes her obligations to this country, because her papers and her public men have been declaring that France never ought to be asked to pay a dollar, although her name is on a paper promising solemnly upon the honor of the French Republic that she will pay. That is one way we can collect the debt. There is another way to collect it that I do not care to discuss on the floor of the Senate in open session.

What we need is a man as President, a man as Secretary of the Treasury, who is thinking about the American people and not about the bankers of New York and the bankers of Berlin and London. We are going to have that kind of man some day, but in the meantime when we are confronted with this situation Italy will hand us a contract in which we are told that we must accept 23 to 25 cents on the dollar, and they say, "What are you going to do about that?"

When that is handed to that future President who has a little red American blood in his veins and who will not be controlled by Wall Street, I hope the names of the Senators who put this black infamy upon our Republic, who robbed a helpless people who have never had a chance to express their opinions, will be handed along with the document.

Now, Mr. President, I am ready that Senators who favor this debt settlement with Italy shall vote on this question. They may consummate this infamy; they may refuse to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed for the purpose of making a change that can not be objected to by any reasonable man. They may ride in their party car, driven by the great financial interests, filled with the admiring throng of Republican Senators, with a few Democrats riding on the tail end.

I desire to say nothing unpleasant, but this debt settlement can not be justified in reason; it can not be justified in good conscience. The American people have never had an opportunity to pass upon it. Let it be brought in here after the next election. I challenge, I dare any man to postpone this measure until after that time. Then I challenge and dare any candidate to go before his people and say, "I am going to settle the Italian debt for from 23 to 25 cents on the dollar; I am going to extend its payment for 62 years, with annual payments of 1.1 per cent, and at the end of the 62 years the debt itself is to be wiped out. I am going to do this for the Government of Mussolini and for the people who permit him to sit there as a monstrous blot upon modern civilization, as a denial of every doctrine which we announced during the World War, as a repudiation of everything in the nature of freedom or democracy, as an insult to modern intelligence and modern civilization. I am going to do that." Do it in the State of Maine, if you dare; do it in the State of California, if you dare; do it in Oklahoma, if you dare; do it in any State of this Union. I can take a yellow dog with an honest record and beat any man who dares to make such an announcement to his people.

What thanks are we getting for all this? In France the name of America is hissed by every audience in every theater. In France the greatest newspaper of Paris only last week declared that they ought to make American tourists pay in gold; that thus they would pay five times as much as anybody else had to pay for food and lodging and whatever else they purchased; and that that would be only a just and proper way to treat these "pigs of Americans." They also complained bitterly that we were over there eating them out of house and home, eating the food that they might have, although we are paying a price they fix and giving them American gold for it, for while an American buys in France over there he has to pay his gold in exchange for the francs or give them American exchange for the franc, which is the same as gold. Those are the thanks we get.

They received our boys with flowers and with kisses and with cheers, but now they hiss at us and spit upon us. There is to-day more good feeling for America, I apprehend, in Germany than there is in France. This is our experience. Give these foreigners a discount of 75 per cent and they will hate us just as badly for making them pay the 25 per cent as if we asked them for the whole amount. Give them a period of 62 years in which to pay and that means a period of 62 years in which they will hate us because they have to pay. The more we concede the more unreasonable will be their demands.

In the meantime their armed bodies are forming. Their "master's voice" is the voice of tyranny. His black shadow falls across the sunlit plains where peace has been once more established. The rattle of his sword is a discordant note in the restored harmony of the world. His credit will be established; his honor will be increased; his power will be magnified when his representative can report back that he has brought the great American Republic to its knees and has compelled it to settle for 25 cents on the dollar.

Senators may smile and smile. I hold no brief of threat; we all must vote our judgment; but since we are engaged in prophesying, let me prophesy. Since the members of this commission project their seerlike minds 62 years into the future, and say that for all that time Italy can not pay, may I be guilty of the temerity of saying that when the American people understand this settlement there will be a reckoning, and so far as I am concerned I am willing the reckoning shall be charged against Democrats as well as Republicans.

This is altogether the biggest steal in all history. At no other time was it proposed to give away a thousand million dollars by the votes of men who are voting away the money of the people instead of their own money.

What this country needs, sir, is a political upheaval. It needs a storm, and the storm will come. It will be a storm of ballots; it will be a peaceful revolution, if you please, but it will be accompanied, in my judgment, by indignation. It needs a storm that will take the deadwood that has been floated in here on political streams and cast it out of the waters. It needs a storm that will awaken the conscience of the American people to the betrayals that are being daily perpetrated upon them. It needs a storm that will clear the atmosphere so that the people on the Pacific coast as well as the people in the near vicinity may see how the hand of the New York financiers is reaching over and directing the affairs of this great Republic. I repeat, I am not enemy of honest capital; I believe in the protection of money; but, sir, whenever a country comes under the domination of money—not of men—when the clink of the dollar can be heard above the voices of the people—when a country reaches that condition nothing but a political storm and revolution will change the situation.

I do not hesitate to turn to my Democratic associates and to ask them again, as I have asked them on previous occasions, what is the Democratic Party here for? To join in all of these nefarious schemes? To unite with Mr. Mellon in all of his demands? Some days ago I heard my secretary, Mr. Hicklin Yates, define the modern Democrat. He said he was a man who worshiped at the shrine of Woodrow Wilson and voted with Andrew Mellon. [Laughter.]

We united with those across the aisle on a tax bill and abandoned the policy we had advocated here for years. If the Democrats had stood solid, there were enough insurgent Republican votes to have carried the day and have written the tax bill. We formed a coalition with the Republicans, and when Democrats coalesce with the hard-boiled element of the Republican Party they simply go into its digestive apparatus and they do not even disturb its stomach, for a Republican stomach can digest anything that has ever been produced in heaven above, the earth beneath, or the waters under the earth. [Laughter.]

I compliment them in one sense. They do have a policy; they do know what they are going to undertake. Even if it is a buccaneering expedition, it is well organized, and when they get through with the one they are on they have another one ready before the stupid Democrats over here find out what happens to them. [Laughter.]

We get up here on the floor of the Senate and stick pins in them. We deliver homilies about the President riding a hobby horse. That is the most innocent thing he ever did in his life and the most commendable. [Laughter.]

We make some flamboyant speeches here about Thomas Jefferson, the great principles of Thomas Jefferson; but Thomas Jefferson never wrote a law in all his life that was not a law granting greater liberties to the people. Every time his pen touched paper it was to declare once more for the old liberties and to demand new ones. The Bill of Rights, which sprang principally from his brain, was altogether a declaration of rights for the people. The statute of religious liberty was a declaration in favor of the right of man to worship and to think, to go to church or to stay away from church, to live under the bending skies of God and walk around like a man, each a sovereign, each man master of himself, each man restrained from interfering with the rights of his fellowman. But over here we can sit down with our little hammers and we can forge a little chain here; we can put a restriction there; we can get an-

other padlock to place upon human rights; we can set up organizations to invade the home, to place their unholy hands upon the brow of motherhood. We can hear it advocated that the constabulary have the right to enter every home of the land if some ruffian bearing the badge of the Government sees fit to say he thinks there is beer in that house. We can hear the statement made by Senators that men who violate a law that is purely a *malum prohibitum* law, having no relation whatever to those things that are naturally called crimes, ought to be executed. The man who will talk about executing another man for making a bottle of beer is as much worse than the man who made the bottle of beer as murder is worse than making beer; and you can not sanctify murder, sir, by having a few gentlemen down in Congress say, "Be it enacted."

We talk about Thomas Jefferson, and we repudiate him in every breath. What is our policy to-day? Our policy chiefly is to find out where Andrew W. Mellon is going, and then fall in in an ignominious position at the tail end of the procession. No wonder the people of this country repudiate the Democratic Party! No wonder the only part of the country we hold is the solid South; and we would not hold the solid South to-day if it were not for the race question in the South.

I appeal to Democrats here to awaken to their duty to guard this country; for, with a Republican majority, the Lord God of Hosts knows that the country needs guardians constantly on watch, needs men in the towers, with ceaseless vigilance, to protect the rights of the American people. We have nothing of that kind to-day. We have not any more concert of action or continuity of purpose than a lot of chickens in a barnyard when an owl comes sailing across the sky.

This measure could have been beaten. If the Democratic Party had stood solidly there were enough votes on the other side of the Chamber to have defeated this measure; but the regular over there heard his master's voice. He wanted to have somebody appointed a United States marshal or a revenue collector or to fill some other job, and the word came down from the White House to all of these people: "Line up! Keep in line with Calvin Coolidge!" Not "Keep in line with the right"; not "Keep in line with justice"; not "Keep in line with the principles of equity and good conscience"; but "Keep in line with Calvin Coolidge! If you do not, you know you have not got those appointments yet out in your State." So they trekked in and took the regular, old-fashioned Republican lock step, hand on the shoulder, and lifting the left leg at the same time; and some day, when our vision has been improved by some wonderful invention as our ears have been improved by the radio, we will be able to observe the stripes upon the lock-step crowd that we can not see now with our dull eyes.

But over here what a crowd we are! I can admire efficiency, even if it is the efficiency of a highwayman or a bootlegger, each of them about equally contemptible; but I hold in immeasurable and unutterable contempt a body that is supposed to be an organization and that has no policy. If we do not rectify our conduct we ought to adjourn sine die and let some respectable organization come into the field that has some other policy than the mere reelection to their seats of the particular gentlemen now in office.

But coming back to this loan business, as nearly as I can make out, for this great act of national generosity and kindness extended in the hour of direst need, for this act that put food in the stomachs of the people of France and of Italy, for this act that put clothing upon their backs and shoes upon their feet, for this act that put arms in their hands and munitions in their belts, for this act that helped to stop the invading armies of Germany as they swept on into Italy and on into France, we receive their hatreds and their maledictions; and I can not help recurring to the wisdom of the philosophy of Shakespeare:

Neither a borrower nor a lender be,
For loan oft loses both itself and friend,
And borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry.
This above all: To thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

I commend the last line to the American Senate, and I send my condolences to a country helpless while the robbery is done.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, if some one on the other side of this proposition desires to discuss it, I shall not impose myself upon the Senate at this time; but I suppose they are going to follow the usual custom of saying nothing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not the purpose of the junior Senator from Missouri to say nothing. I shall have something to say.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator can proceed then.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it is quite true that "borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry" and "lending often loseth both itself and friend"; and it may well be that during a period of 62 years the relation of creditor and debtor that exists between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Italy may breed and continue to breed feelings of animosity and ill-will. It is always so, Mr. President. Relations of creditor and debtor are never desirable, especially between nations.

A trading with the enemy act was enacted by the Congress of the United States and under that act actually, previously to the declaration of war by the United States, during the period of war after the armistice, money was shoveled out of the Treasury of the United States to these foreign countries without reference to their capacity to pay, without reference to its being a good loan or not. It was done in the case of Italy. The laws were not observed, and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, for reasons which seem to me to be specious and not good, loaned \$1,642,000,000 to the Government of Italy when it did not appear that that Government was worthy of that loan, that she had the capacity to pay, or that the debt would ever be returned. Just why the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, made those loans under those circumstances in violation of the laws that had been passed and of the terms under which the acknowledgments for those loans were to be taken does not appear.

Mr. President, the patron saint of our country is George Washington. The next great saint of our country is Abraham Lincoln. A golden thread of political thought and political philosophy runs from George Washington squarely through John Marshall, Webster, and Clay to Lincoln; and it survives, I trust, unto this good day.

The Republican Party does stand for something. It does represent great principles of government. It has a definite philosophy. Regardless of what its plans may be as to policies now or hereafter, there are underlying principles which can be stated, fundamentals of faith; and the creed of the Republican Party is neither hard to find nor difficult to defend.

We believe in the indivisibility of the citizenship of all the people of the United States. We believe in the right of every citizen in the United States to life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness. We believe that we belong to a party which has the capacity and is worthy to conduct the affairs of the Government of the United States under the Constitution of the United States and under the leadership of Calvin Coolidge.

I do not see that that has a tremendous amount to do with the particular problem that presents itself to us to-day. There is no man in the Senate more versed, more apt, more wonderful in the powers of oratory and the powers of argument than my colleague from Missouri [Mr. REED]. He belongs to one party; I belong to another. He is proud of the heritage which he possesses as coming from Thomas Jefferson. I am just as proud of the heritage that I claim comes from Washington and from John Marshall.

The question here to-day is the question of the reconsideration of the vote by which we adopted the Italian debt settlement. The question was raised at the last hour. The vote was to be taken on Wednesday at 4 o'clock. When the bell rang at 4 o'clock, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] proposed an amendment. That amendment went to the third, fifth, and seventh clauses of our settlement with Italy. I felt at that time that time was not of the essence of our settlement with Italy. Inasmuch as we receive but \$5,000,000 per year for a period of five years without interest, it did not occur to me that time would make so much difference. My understanding was that the Senator from Nebraska had introduced an amendment to the plan, which permitted the bonds which we are to receive under this settlement to be sold, maybe in Italy; and if sold there, that the effect of such a sale of those bonds in Italy to the Italian people might result in a value for those bonds which they would not have if the rights of the Italian people to invest in those bonds were foreclosed by the provisions of the pending settlement.

I therefore voted for the amendment as offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL]. That, it seems to me, is the one question pending in this case to-day. My understanding is—and I get it from the Senator from Nebraska—that his amendment is an exact copy of the provision under which similar bonds received by the British Government from Italy on its settlement with Italy bear in the agreement made between the English and the Italian Governments. It reads as follows:

The principal and interest of all bonds issued or to be issued hereunder shall be paid without deduction for, and shall be exempt from any and all taxes and other public dues, present or future, imposed by or under authority of the Kingdom of Italy or any political or local taxing authority within the Kingdom of Italy.

The Senator from Nebraska has explained his amendment. It has been expatiated on somewhat at length by my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I have heard no statement from the chairman of the Finance Committee as to whether or not the provisions contained in the pending agreement between this Government and Italy are there by design, and are intended to foreclose the purchase of these securities in Italy by the citizens of Italy.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no such intention, and I will say to the Senator that the exact words contained in this settlement have been in every settlement that has been made with any foreign country.

If the Senator will be further patient with me, I want to say that in the English settlement with Italy the following is incorporated:

1. Italy agrees to pay, and Great Britain to accept, in satisfaction of the aforesaid war debt, the following annuities:

In respect of the current financial year, £2,000,000.

In respect of the next two financial years, £4,000,000 a year.

In respect of the next four financial years, £4,250,000 a year.

In respect of succeeding financial years, until 1986-87, £4,500,000 a year.

In respect of the financial year 1987-88, £2,250,000.

The above payments will be made in sterling at the Bank of England, London, on the 15th March, 1926, and thereafter in equal half-yearly installments on the 15th September and 15th March of each year, so that the last payment will be made on the 15th September, 1987.

Now—

2. Italy will issue and deliver to the British treasury on or before the 20th February, 1926, a bond substantially in the form set out in the annex to this agreement in respect of each of the payments provided for in article 1 of this agreement.

3. The payments due under all bonds issued in accordance with this agreement shall be made without deduction for, and shall be exempt from any and all taxes and other public dues, present or future, imposed by or under authority of Italy or any political or local taxing authority within Italy.

That is because of the fact that there is no interest whatever on the annuities. It is an annuity plan, pure and simple. Our settlement is not an annuity plan. Our settlement is so much upon the principal, and so much interest. Not only that, but there is a provision in our settlement that those annual payments shall be given in a bond, first, for each of the payments, but we reserve the right to call upon Italy at any time and have them issue those bonds in just the denominations that we may demand. The provision to which the Senator has referred is in the exact words used in the English settlement and in every settlement we have made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator means in the exact words of the settlement between America and England?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is the only resemblance between the settlement made with America and that made with England, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. There is not a resemblance, because the settlement with England is 39 per cent better for Italy than is ours. That can be demonstrated—I stated that before—and I can prove it to the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that the Senator from Utah stated the other day, in answer to a question put to him by the Senator from Michigan, that the bonds had been taken in denominations indicated in the various yearly payments, beginning at \$5,000,000 and ending at \$80,000,000, or whatever the amount was; that they had been taken in those denominations so as to prevent, if possible, the negotiation of those bonds among small holders in America, and thus prevent causes of irritation raised by our citizens for the nonpayment of the bonds. I thought that was a very good answer to the question put by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say again, for the information of the Senator and of the Senate, that the bonds that are to be issued by the Italian Government to Britain remain in the vaults of the British Government. That is the only place they will ever go. Under the arrangement we have with them we can have the bonds issued in different denominations, if we desire, as I have stated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Exactly; they are susceptible of change.

Mr. SMOOT. They are susceptible of change.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Or they are susceptible of conversion into bonds of smaller denominations?

Mr. SMOOT. They are.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was because the Senator from Nebraska had had no opportunity to give us his views with respect to the amendment he offered that I was in favor of a reconsideration of the vote. It gave us an opportunity to go into that phase of the case.

Mr. SMOOT. In brief, the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska means this: Suppose we had a thousand-dollar bond. The Senator wants that bond reduced in value, I suppose, in the same amount the debt had been reduced, or 26 per cent of that amount, and then that to draw a rate of interest, and sold to a man anywhere in the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is a good mathematical way of doing that.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; but I want to ask the Senator this: How on earth are we ever going to be able to sell those bonds to Italian citizens when Italy to-day is suffering from lack of funds? If we did undertake to sell the bonds in Italy, how many could we sell? If we did succeed in selling any, what would it mean? It would mean that it would to that extent interfere with Italy's ability to pay us what she has contracted to pay.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand the Senator from Nebraska, however, the present plan—the plan undertaken in the present agreement—precludes the possibility of selling the bonds in Italy, except under penalty of having them taxed in Italy.

Mr. SMOOT. In other words, if they are sold there, Italy can impose a tax on them if she desires to do so, under the Italian laws, just as England can do under the existing arrangements we have with England. There is not a particle of difference.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, why does the Senator compare this with the British settlement? Why does he pick out one clause in the British settlement which, he tells us, does not exempt England's bonds to us from taxation in Great Britain and use that as an illustration of the wisdom of this settlement, when all the rest of the British settlement is so radically different, when England's bonds are, first, marketable all around the world, and when, second, England proposes to pay us dollar for dollar, at a low rate of interest, but, nevertheless, to pay us? Then the Italian settlement was written, under which they are to pay about 23 cents on the dollar; and I question whether we could sell the bonds at 10 cents to-day if we had them. The Senator says because there was a favorable clause in the British settlement we ought to put that in the Italian settlement, but we are not going to put into the Italian settlement the good propositions that are contained in the English settlement.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the question as to the difference was raised, and I answered that. But I will say to the Senator from Missouri that the settlement we have made with Italy is a 39 per cent better settlement, as far as dollars and cents are concerned, than the settlement England made with Italy.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Certainly it is 39 per cent; and because it is 39 per cent better for us the Senator says we ought to put in the Italian settlement this clause, which makes our bonds worthless in Italy.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it does not make them worthless in Italy. It simply is a clause that has been in every settlement we have made, not only with Great Britain but every country with which we have settled.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator gives these figures as a settlement favorable to Great Britain or favorable to us because of the present value of the settlement. Is not that true?

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator state that again?

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator said that our settlement is more favorable than the settlement between Italy and Great Britain?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. That is true on the valuation of the present worth. That is what the Senator based it on, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. Comparisons were based upon that situation.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator realizes that the English settlement is better than the American settlement, because England gets \$113,000,000 during the first 10 years more than we get. In other words, they want to collect all their money in the beginning of the settlement, and we wait 62 years from now to get ours.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a matter that has been discussed. It is a question of policy. It is a question of ability to pay on the part of Italy.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator thought the wise and economic policy was to let Great Britain have their money in the beginning and we should collect ours 50 or 60 years from now?

Mr. SMOOT. They pay for it, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. They pay for it?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Here is an article in the morning Herald which says:

France is going to agree to the same settlement because they believe America will cancel the debt in a few years.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator believes everything that he sees in the papers as reported by somebody who has no knowledge whatever and can get no better information than anyone else, he is relying upon information which would never enable us to get a settlement. We never would know what they could do even a year hence based on such information. I would like to have some evidence before I would take a clipping from some newspaper as to what they can do.

Mr. HARRISON. Let me read just what the New York Herald said. The Senator may say there is nothing in these reports, but I have not yet found, where every newspaper syndicate carries the same story and all written along the same line, that they are generally wrong. They get these things from somewhere, and every press service in the country carried the story last night. In the New York Herald-Tribune was this article written by Mr. Carter Field, and he is pretty close to the White House and pretty close to the Treasury Department here.

It is known also that the willingness of the French to agree to such heavy payments later on is based to a considerable extent upon the belief that these payments will never have to be made. They are confident that this country will have a change of heart which will result in a forgiving of the debt long before the payments have reached their peak.

The difference between the English settlement and the Italian settlement was that the English tried to get all they could in the beginning. We let them have it, too. In addition to that, Great Britain received \$110,000,000 in gold since 1915 from Italy and retains it. It is there for England to use.

Mr. SMOOT. I could give the Senator some information about it again, but there is no necessity for it.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope some day the Senator will give it.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no necessity for it in this discussion.

Mr. HARRISON. I know, because the Senator has the votes to pass the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. No; that is not what the Senator said.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Utah made the statement that Britain is to receive an annuity. Certainly that does not mean that it is any more of an annuity than what we are to receive. In one sense of the word an annuity is an equal payment over a period of years. That is not the case with Great Britain. The first payment to Great Britain is about \$14,000,000. It then jumps to \$24,000,000, and it then varies down until the final payment is about \$10,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. But the agreement itself says it is an annuity. The agreement says in plain language:

Italy agrees to pay and Great Britain to accept in satisfaction of the aforesaid war debt the following annuities.

Mr. HOWELL. Very well. We now have a definition and know when payments are annuities. I hold in my hand a statement from the Treasury Department of the United States that gives the amount of payments made annually by Italy with no reference to interest. They are \$5,000,000 to begin with, and it gives the total payment for the last year as \$80,988,000. Each of these payments is exactly as much of an annuity as the payments to be made to Great Britain by Italy.

The distinguished Senator from Utah stated that these bonds were to remain in the British Treasury. These bonds contain the same provision that our bonds have—it is identical—"payable to Great Britain or order." The 62 bonds which we receive are payable to the United States or order. There is no more reason to urge that these bonds will remain in the British Treasury than that our bonds will necessarily remain in our Treasury. They are assignable in each case. They are not made payable to Great Britain only. They are assignable and so are our bonds. There is no difference.

Furthermore, as to the sale of these bonds in Italy, the Debt Commission, of which the distinguished Senator from Utah

is a member, has provided as follows in article 7 of the agreement:

In order to facilitate the sale of the bonds in the United States, in Italy, and elsewhere, * * * Italy "will use its good offices to secure the listing of the bonds on such stock exchanges as the Secretary of the Treasury * * * may specify."

The Debt Commission had in mind the sale of these bonds in Italy. It inserted in the agreement the provision I have read, and yet the Senator has said that there was no such idea in mind. What is the meaning of this agreement? It seems to mean one thing at one time and another thing at other times. They included in the agreement a provision contemplating the sale of these bonds in Italy, and then what? They insert a taxable provision that will make it impossible to sell the bonds in Italy.

Mr. President, article 7 is absolutely rendered ineffective by article 3 of the agreement. There is no question but that according to the terms of the settlement it points to a purpose of providing for the sale of bonds in Italy, but after this had been taken care of then they put in a provision that will prevent such sales. That is the trouble with the settlement. I can not believe that the members of the Debt Commission understood the agreement—what the agreement meant—any more than they realized that the settlement really provides for the payment of but 1.1 per cent interest for 62 years and then the cancellation of the debt—\$2,150,151,000—at the end of the period.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I want to say just a word. A distinction is drawn between an annuity and the kind of payments we get. We have had a lot of caviling about terms. What difference does it make or would it make if it were the fact that Italy had said, "We will pay the United States an annuity of \$5,000,000 a year" or "We will pay the United States in interest and principal \$5,000,000 a year." What would be the difference? It would be \$5,000,000 in our pocket in either event, and the name under which we got it would not make much difference to the gentlemen in the United States if Italy had the money to take up its obligations. That sort of argument is puerile.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the vote day before yesterday on this resolution carried "glad tidings of good news" to at least two places in the world. One was Rome, and the other was the administrative offices here in Washington. We have not seen the glare from any bonfires celebrating it out in the Middle West. We have not read in the papers where the people were thrilled in any other part of the country.

I read from yesterday afternoon's Washington Star an item carried by the Associated Press from Rome, merely in order that the RECORD may be brightened through the ages by this article and in order that posterity may know how the Senate's action was received by Mussolini and Fascists in Italy. I do not read it with the hope that it might change any votes here, because I know the sails are set and the wind is full. All conditions are favorable to carry this ratification by a majority as it was carried day before yesterday:

ROME, April 22.—Ratification of the Italian war debt settlement by the United States Senate brings warm expressions of gratification from high governmental officials. Premier Mussolini, after reading the first bulletin last evening, said, "I am most happy to hear the news."

To-day similar expressions came from Finance Minister Count Volpi, who headed the debt mission to Washington, and Dino Grandi, the undersecretary for foreign affairs. Count Volpi asked the Associated Press to send his "grateful greetings to the American Government—

Not to the American people, but he sends his grateful greetings to the American Government—

who sustained with such firmness and loyalty the agreed settlement."

I do not know to whom he was referring when he used the term "loyalty." It must be loyalty to Italy, certainly not loyalty to the American taxpayer. He said further:

"Indeed," he added, "I wish to send the same greetings to all those Senators who participated in the long discussion with such fervid friendship toward our country. On the other hand, I prefer to forget some of the unjust speeches pronounced in the American Senate, because I attribute them to inexact knowledge of the Italian situation."

He further explained this thought by saying emphatically, "Italy lives in a régime of liberty, tranquillity, and work such as she never experienced before."

* * * * *

During the long and often painful discussion in the American Senate—

Why he snatched the word "painful" to express his ideas, I do not know, but he used the term.

During the long and often painful discussion in the American Senate I considered my duty as a member of the government signatory to the agreement to maintain the greatest reserve, but now that the agreement is ratified with a noteworthy majority, and now that the American people have given new proof of acknowledging that the agreement is an equitable transaction—

He is mistaken about that. The American people have not given their acknowledgment to this settlement. It is left to be seen in November what they have to say about it. Some Senators had better get busy reading what has been said in the Senate—they do not stay in the Senate to listen to it—so that they may explain to their constituents in the coming campaign their favoritism and friendship toward Italy as against taxpayers of America—

thus pronouncing a new word of sympathy and friendship toward the Italian people, I feel free to say how much we appreciate all this and how satisfied I am. Ratification of the agreement has great significance not only for the relations between America and Italy, but also for European relations in general.

Signor Grandi, speaking for the Italian Government, said: "We are deeply touched by the declarations made by Secretary Mellon after the ratification."

Secretary Mellon gave out an interview; he expressed himself as delighted that the Senate had ratified this agreement; but Italy need not mistake the expressions and views of the Secretary of the Treasury as being the views of the American people—

Signor Grandi, speaking for the Italian Government, said: "We are deeply touched by the declarations made by Secretary Mellon after the ratification. Coming from a representative of the executive branch of the United States Government, they are particularly significant and welcome."

"By Premier Mussolini's instructions"—

"By Premier Mussolini's instructions"—

"they will have wide diffusion in the press of the entire Nation and will serve to strengthen the already firm ties of cordial friendship between the two nations."

He is going to scatter them out everywhere through Italy, and it may be that they will be scattered broadcast over here—

Ratification of the debt accord is considered by the Italian Government as a moral and political victory for Fascism, according to foreign office spokesman. Italy, he pointed out, had regarded the accord as a purely financial matter until, during the last few months both in the senatorial discussion and the comments of certain sections of the American press, the political aspect of the question was brought to the fore.

It became a struggle between Fascism and anti-Fascism—between so-called democracy and dictatorship, Signor Grandi said.

Let me read that again to the Senator from Utah and to those Senators who on the roll call the other day voted for the ratification of this agreement. This is Signor Grandi, the spokesman of the Italian Government, speaking to the world, not only to the Italian people but to the American people:

It became a struggle between Fascism and anti-Fascism—between so-called democracy and dictatorship.

As suggested to me by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] he ought to send the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] a black shirt [laughter], and he ought also to send black shirts to some other Senators who voted to ratify this agreement.

But I am unable to refrain from drawing the obvious conclusion that the Senate's action now means more than ratification of a financial arrangement; that it also represents a moral victory for Fascism and a political victory for present-day Italy in the eyes of America and the world.

That is what you have done, Senators. The Senator from Utah speaks of our agreement with Italy being more favorable in its terms to the United States than the Italian agreement with Great Britain is to Great Britain. The statesmen of Great Britain have "put it all over" the representatives of America in their negotiations with Italy. The Senator from Utah runs to cover as to the proposition which is presented in the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL], when he knows that Italy has not deposited in Washington \$120,000,000 in gold. Italy has had no deposit of gold here in Washington since 1915. Under the terms of the British agreement with Italy, however, Italy has permitted \$120,000,000 of gold to remain in London, and it is to stay there under the terms of the agreement, except as to certain sums which may be released from time to time upon payments of portions of the indebtedness. The Senator from Utah recognizes that the

English statesmen tried to get as much out of Italy in their settlement in the earlier years as possible; that they were not much interested in the period 20, 30, 40, 50, or 60 years from now; but it seems that the Senator from Utah and his colleagues on the Debt Commission thought more of getting some kind of a settlement; that they cared nothing about how much was to be realized during the few years in the early life of the agreement, just so it might appear that the present worth might be more than the payment to Great Britain in the end.

Here [exhibiting] are figures prepared by Mr. McCoy, the actuary of the Treasury Department, in which he shows all down the line in parallel columns that even as far off as the year 1936 America will get only \$15,000,000, while at that time Great Britain will be getting \$21,000,000; that until 1940 Great Britain will be collecting annually more than the United States will be collecting; and yet the Senator from Utah thinks that he has won a great victory.

If the Senators who are to come up for reelection in November, whether in Ohio or Indiana or out midst the Golden Gate of California or in Utah or in New York or in Massachusetts or in Kansas, or anywhere else, even in Nevada and in Arizona—if they think they can defend the ratification of an agreement with Italy that will make the American taxpayer in 62 years pay \$3,680,870,000, while the Italian taxpayer will be paying only \$369,677,000 in interest charges, then well and good.

I can not believe that they can do it. I do not believe there was ever presented to the American Congress a more nefarious and indefensible proposition than is presented in this Italian debt-settlement measure. It is discriminatory; it is unfair; it shows a degree of favoritism that is inexcusable. Yet Senators try to press it and force it through here even by the threat of a motion to table a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. Why all this haste? The Republican majority showed no such haste as this when they were trying to give some relief to the American taxpayers by the revenue bills which have come before the Senate.

In 1921 we passed a revenue bill which reduced the taxes of the American people \$670,000,000; but Senators on the other side showed no such degree of impatience in pressing that measure to a vote as they show now. In 1924, not along party lines but by the cooperation of Members of both parties in the Senate and House of Representatives, a further reduction of \$472,000,000 was made in the taxes of the American taxpayers; and then in 1926 a further reduction of \$387,000,000 was made. The Republican majority claimed those reductions as great achievements. And they were. You were entitled to much credit because your party was in power. I shall not speak of the details that divided the two parties along the lines of reducing the taxes on some as against others, but we gave a reduction in the total sum of \$1,529,000,000. The Republican Party claimed it, as I have said, as an achievement. They went home and prated about it, and yet they bring here and press for consideration, even holding a motion to table over our heads, a bill that takes away every cent and more of the money that we gave by way of a reduction of taxes for the last five years. If they can answer it, all right.

I know on this motion we are defeated. I suppose we will get no more votes than we got the other day, but we go down with our colors flying, and the majority will answer for it elsewhere than here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has just said that our Republican friends are going to suffer great losses by reason of their action on the Italian war debt settlement bill. I am inclined to think they are, but I want to congratulate them on one accession which they have made by reason of this settlement. I read from an Associated Press dispatch sent out immediately after the Italian debt settlement agreement was ratified on April 21. It reads as follows:

Doheny now Republican. Oil magnate, for years Democratic leader, switches affiliation. Los Angeles, Calif., April 22.—

April 22 was the next day after Senators on the other side had ratified the agreement by which they gave to Mussolini's Government a billion and a half dollars—

Edward L. Doheny, the oil magnate, for years a wheel horse of the Democratic Party, has hitched his political affiliations to Republican ranks.

"I have registered as a Republican for the first time," he said to-day, "because I decided to affiliate with and support the party which more than any other embodies the forces and policies which have produced our unprecedented era of prosperity."

And he might well have added that he has decided to affiliate with that party which fights with such heroic courage on the

same side with Fascism and with dictatorship. Our Republican friends have ratified this agreement by their numbers, but, in my judgment, they have ratified it to the undoing of many of them at the next election.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri to reconsider the vote by which House bill 6773 was passed.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TRAMMELL (when Mr. FLETCHER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is unavoidably absent. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON (when his name was called). Upon this matter I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. If the Senator from Virginia were present, he would vote "nay," and if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. McKELLAR (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST]. If he were present, he would vote "nay," and if I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. NYE (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPER]. If he were present, I understand that he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PEPPER (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GERRY (when the name of Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas was called). I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF]. If the Senator from Arkansas were present, he would vote "yea"; and if the Senator from Rhode Island were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON (when the name of Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON]. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea." He has a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD].

Mr. WHEELER (when Mr. WALSH's name was called). My colleague [Mr. WALSH] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea." He is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER], who, I understand, if present, would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR. I find that I can transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST] to the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY]. I do so and vote "yea."

Mr. BRATTON. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON]. It has already been announced that if he were present he would vote "nay." If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] is absent on account of illness.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. STECK] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. HARRELD. May I inquire if the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. HARRELD. I have a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina, and in his absence I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. BROUSSARD (after having voted in the negative). I failed to state that I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], who is unavoidably absent. In view of the fact that he would vote as I have voted, I will let my vote stand.

Mr. DILL (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. DILL. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Arizona, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BRATTON. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. If present, the Senators from Massachusetts and Alabama would vote "nay" on this question, and the Senators from Montana and Nebraska would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—24			
Borah	Harrison	McMaster	Shipstead
Bratton	Heflin	Mayfield	Stephens
Couzens	Howell	Neely	Swanson
Frazier	La Follette	Overman	Trammell
George	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.	Tyson
Harris	McKellar	Sheppard	Wheeler
NAYS—43			
Ashurst	Fernald	Keyes	Reed, Pa.
Bayard	Ferris	King	Sackett
Bingham	Fess	McKinley	Shortridge
Broussard	Gerry	McLean	Smoot
Bruce	Gillett	McNary	Stanfield
Copeland	Goff	Norbeck	Wadsworth
Cummins	Gooding	Oddie	Warren
Curtis	Hale	Pepper	Watson
Dale	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Weller
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Willis
Edge	Kendrick	Ransdell	
NOT VOTING—29			
Blease	Ernst	Moses	Smith
Butler	Fletcher	Norris	Steck
Cameron	Glass	Nye	Underwood
Capper	Greene	Pittman	Walsh
Caraway	Harrell	Robinson, Ark.	Williams
Dill	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	
du Pont	Means	Schall	
Edwards	Metcalf	Simmons	

So the Senate refused to reconsider the vote by which House bill 6773 was passed.

CLAIM OF THE GOVERNMENT OF NORWAY (H. DOC. NO. 343)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to a claim presented by the Government of Norway for the payment of interest on certain sums advanced by it for this Government in connection with its representation of American interests in Moscow, and I recommend that an appropriation be authorized to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 23, 1926.

WILLIAM WISEMAN, BRITISH VICE CONSUL (H. DOC. NO. 344)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Acting Secretary of State in regard to the services in behalf of the United States of William Wiseman, British vice consul at Salina Cruz, Mexico, during the period from April 12, 1914, to December 13, 1917, when with the permission of the British Government and at the request of this Government he had charge of the American consulate at Salina Cruz and of American interests in the district surrounding that place. The conclusion reached by the Acting Secretary of State has my approval and I recommend that the Congress authorize an appropriation of \$9,200 to be paid to Mr. Wiseman in recognition of the services which he so generously rendered.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 23, 1926.

PARK AND PLAYGROUND SYSTEM OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

Mr. JONES of Washington. I submit a conference report on behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and I ask for its immediate consideration. I think there will be no debate upon it.

The report was read and agreed to, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5830) amending the act entitled "An act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of

the National Capital," approved June 6, 1924, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

ARTHUR CAPPER,
W. L. JONES,
WILLIAM H. KING,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

F. N. ZIHLMAN,
ERNEST W. GIBSON,
THOS. L. BLANTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

ROCK CREEK AND POTOMAC PARKWAY COMMISSION

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4785) to enable the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission to complete the acquisition of the land authorized to be acquired by the public buildings appropriation act, approved March 4, 1913, for the connecting parkway between Rock Creek Park, the Zoological Park, and Potomac Park, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

ARTHUR CAPPER,
W. L. JONES,
WILLIAM H. KING,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

F. N. ZIHLMAN,
ERNEST W. GIBSON,
THOS. L. BLANTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I shall not ask for the immediate consideration of the conference report, because it probably will lead to considerable discussion. This is a measure that involves a question of contributions upon the part of the District of Columbia and the Federal Government in reference to appropriations. I ask that the report lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will lie on the table.

STATUE OF DR. CRAWFORD W. LONG

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD the proceedings on March 30, 1926, in Statuary Hall of the Capitol, on the occasion of the unveiling and presentation by the State of Georgia of the marble statue of Dr. Crawford W. Long. Doctor Long was the first to use an anesthetic in a surgical operation.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUE OF DR. CRAWFORD W. LONG

EXERCISES IN STATUARY HALL IN THE CAPITOL AT WASHINGTON, D. C., TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 1926, ON THE OCCASION OF THE UNVEILING AND PRESENTATION BY THE STATE OF GEORGIA OF THE MARBLE STATUE OF DR. CRAWFORD W. LONG (1815-1878) THE DISCOVERER OF ETHER ANESTHESIA

The audience was called to order at 3 o'clock p. m. by Dr. Frank K. Boland, president of the Long Memorial Association, presiding.

INVOCATION BY REV. SAM W. SMALL

Our Heavenly Father, we are gathered to-day in this great national capital, and in a historic chamber of this great building whose atmosphere has thrilled to the eloquence of some of the greatest men of our generation and of generations gone by. We are assembled to represent the citizens of one of the great States of this immutable Union of ours, for the purpose of unveiling to the eyes of the living and to those of the coming generations the marble effigy of one of Thy humble and noble souls, who, inspired by Thy spirit of compassion to humanity, discovered the remedy and the soothing for the acute pains which formerly accompanied the incisions or the excisions of surgery upon the human body. This discovery and application by this faithful and honored son of Georgia has gone around the globe, to assuage the pains of humanity, to bring relief to millions who are suffering from that which to them seems incurable; and we pray that while we perform this sacred office of putting among those who occupy this Valhalla of the Nation's genius, of the Nation's spirit, who represented its religion, its statesmanship, and its eloquence, that his figure may be looked upon by the passing throngs for ages to come as that of one of the great benefactors of the human race, inspired to perform His will unto His children. Let Thy spirit cover the

occasion; bless all those who have engaged in the noble enterprise now concluded; and may the spirit which animated this humble country doctor of Georgia become the universal spirit of all of us who would serve Thee in faithfulness, and our brethren with the spirit of helpfulness. We ask it all for Christ's sake. Amen.

Doctor BOLAND, Ladies and gentlemen, after years of patience and disappointment I assure you it is no mere formality when I say that it gives me almost overwhelming pleasure, on behalf of the Crawford W. Long Memorial Association, to welcome this distinguished audience to the exercises of the unveiling of the statue of Georgia's illustrious son, Crawford W. Long.

Eighty-four years ago, March 30, 1842, at the age of 27, his sympathy and love for suffering humanity, his keen power of observation, and his supreme courage led him to be the first to do, finally, what physicians and scientists had tried in vain to accomplish for all the centuries—to perform a surgical operation without producing pain. By this achievement, in that remote, isolated Georgia village, the young physician gave to mankind a blessing for which no praise, no expression of gratitude can be too great.

Most appropriate it was then, when in 1902 the General Assembly of Georgia voted to accept the invitation of the National Government to place the statues of two of its citizens in this sacred hall, that Crawford W. Long should be chosen as one of the number; the only physician, with one exception, to be thus honored by any State with a recognition of his contribution to medical science.

For 21 years we waited for the State of Georgia to carry out the resolution which it had adopted. Then, four years ago, through the inspiration and loyalty and persistent energy of a faithful apprentice who had worked in Doctor Long's drug store in the classic city of Athens, there came into existence the Crawford W. Long Memorial Association, with the determination to place this memorial here at the earliest possible moment. To-day, through the activity of this organization and the liberality of the people of Georgia and their efforts, you will see the realization of our dreams, done in Georgia marble, to be surpassed by none, the beautiful product of the imagination of a master sculptor, John Massey Rhind, executed by a superb carver, James K. Watt.

It is a proud day in the history of our State; it is a memorable occasion in the history of medicine; it is a glorious hour in the life of the former young apprentice; it is an event to bring unspeakable joy to the hearts of those two dear daughters of Doctor Long who honor us with their presence here to-day.

The first speaker is Dr. Joseph Jacobs, who was Doctor Long's assistant, now an authority in botany and pharmacy, an outstanding citizen and philanthropist, representing the pharmacists of America.

ADDRESS BY JOSEPH JACOBS, PH. M., SC. D., FOR THE PHARMACEUTICAL PROFESSION; FRIEND AND FORMER EMPLOYEE OF CRAWFORD W. LONG

Mr. Chairman and daughters of Doctor Long, ladies and gentlemen, an ardent love and admiration for Georgia is a known characteristic of her people. Yielding to none of her sister States in loyalty or readiness for service to our great compact of union, our people at the same time are prone to look with pride upon the achievements of Georgia's sons who have done so much to promote the general welfare.

Her very origin was an experiment in the history of nations. It was the first time that a charter was taken and granted for the purpose of removing the hopeless and the distressed from the old country and bringing them to the new, where they could achieve independence and prosperity. The generations have passed, and Georgia's sons have always shown a feeling of helpfulness to the poor and the distressed. It will be found that all the generations of Georgia's sons since Oglethorpe landed at Yamacraw Bluff have borne a spirit of sympathy and helpfulness in their breasts toward the unfortunate, the suffering, or the forlorn.

As a pharmacist it was my great good fortune in my early days to be an apprentice and student in the drug store in the town of Athens, Ga., owned and operated by the man whom we commemorate to-day, and I was the recipient of many kindnesses at his hands, and I am here to testify to the greatness of this man in every respect; as a physician, kind and gentle; and as a friend, loyal and true; as a citizen, brave, wise, and patriotic.

All the nations of the earth commemorate this man, whose discovery lessened pain, and the danger and the terror of the surgeon's knife.

The skilled and gentle ministrations of the learned physician were his; the tender love for family and for friends he ever exhibited in acts of kindness; the poor and distressed found in him ever a ready and helpful sympathy; his city and State knew him as patriotic, brave, and wise.

For my humble part, may I, in reverence, be permitted to say, as Robert Burns said of his Glencairn—

"The bridegroom may forget the bride
Was made his wedded wife yestreen;
The monarch may forget the crown
That on his head an hour has been;

The mother may forget the child
That smiles sae sweetly on her knee;
But I'll remember thee, my friend,
And all that thou has done for me."

[Applause.]

Doctor BOLAND. The statue will now be unveiled by Mrs. Frances Long Taylor and Miss Emma Long, the daughters of Crawford W. Long.

The statue at this point was unveiled.

Doctor BOLAND. Crawford W. Long graduated from the University of Georgia with an A. M. degree in the year 1835. While at the university his roommate was Alexander H. Stephens, afterwards vice president of the Confederacy, who is the other Georgian chosen to have his statue placed in this hall.

The presentation of this statue to the State of Georgia will be by Hon. Richard B. Russell, chief justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and president of the board of trustees of the University of Georgia, who was one of the incorporators of this memorial association, an eminent jurist, and a beloved citizen of Georgia.

ADDRESS OF HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, CHIEF JUSTICE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA AND PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, to one whose station has denied the privilege of playing any part in the great drama enacted in this our National Capitol, a call to speak in the Hall of Fame of America (fit reproduction alike of the Parthenon at Athens and the Pantheon at Rome), is naturally not without embarrassment. However, the setting of this splendid and historic scene should itself suffice to supply inspiration. I am most fortunate, too, in the manner in which I have been presented by one of the most distinguished alumni of Georgia's University, itself the oldest State institution of learning in the Union. Dr. Frank K. Boland, as chief executive of the Crawford W. Long Memorial Association, has displayed the highest executive ability. He it was who concentrated and vitalized in practical form the disassociated elements of affection which prior to his leadership, not working in concert, had more than once failed to provide a fitting memorial to a great discoverer. By this great physician and scientist, worthy successor of Long, to-day the work crowns the thought, and the tribute of a mother's love and pride stands before us.

Speaking for the Crawford W. Long Memorial Association, I deem it most appropriate to express to him the gratitude of every one who truly loves the memory of Long. I am greatly honored also to follow and to speak from the same stage with him who of all Georgians is the one who should most appropriately have been selected to speak upon this occasion. It is well known that for many years the claim that Dr. Crawford W. Long, of Georgia, was the first to use sulphuric ether for the alleviation of pain was strenuously contested. No man ever devoted himself more continuously, more unreservedly, more laboriously, or more unselfishly to procuring, compiling, publishing, and establishing forever by legally competent testimony Doctor Long's right to his discovery than Dr. Joseph Jacobs, who has just preceded me. Neither Jonathan's love for David nor Damon's devotion to Pythias, as idealized in history and romance, exceeded the love of Doctor Jacobs to his preceptor, Doctor Long, and his unswerving, unalterable determination that justice should be done him.

Under the constitution of Georgia the general assembly is without power to appropriate money except for named purposes of government. Consequently, although the general assembly—upon the passage of the act of Congress requesting each State to place two of its most distinguished citizens in the hall of fame—selected Crawford W. Long and Alexander H. Stephens and reserved for them the places here, it was without power to appropriate any money to place their statues here. The stone we dedicate to-day represents private contribution of numerous Georgians, but whether including or aside from the matter of money, it is but a matter of justice that I should say what can not be contradicted that but for the devoted and continuous services of Joseph Jacobs the spot graced by his form and devoted to Doctor Long would be as bare as is that empty space designed to support a lasting memorial to the great Alexander H. Stephens.

Here, to the house of our fathers, we Georgians have come. In this, our fathers' house, we are at home. Loving every section of this great Union, our hearts are thrilled as we see preserved in ever-enduring bronze or imperishable stone the great Americans, with whom we are proud to claim brotherhood, whose effigies our sister States have presented as a lasting contribution to our common fame. Who is not thrilled as he casts his eyes toward New Hampshire and sees the lion of oratory, whose unanswerable arguments, clothed with all the force of logic and dignity of diction, shook Senate after Senate at his pleasure—the incomparable Daniel Webster! What American who loves to contemplate masterful masculinity, great initiative, and uncontrollable courage, is not thrilled as he beholds the heroic statue of Ethan Allen, the hero of Ticonderoga! He who aught remembers can never forget the incomparable services of that great American which the

mother of States and statesmen lent to the Union. He who was "first in peace, first in war, and first in the hearts of his countrymen"—the incomparable Washington. Here stand around us—an inspiration, not only to us, but to those who shall ever hereafter follow us in the long march of the centuries—Clay and Jackson and Austin and Lincoln and Garfield, statesmen and scholars and soldiers and inventors and patriots, to each and all of whom a reunited country acknowledges an ineffaceable debt of gratitude for immortal services.

To-day we come in behalf of the citizens who have contributed to its creation and of the university, which trained his fledgling wings to mount in the bold cerulean blue of knowledge, in the clear ether of culture and science, to present the statue of Crawford W. Long. We place his effigy under the dome of this magnificent Capitol of many multiplied millions of the greatest people on the face of the earth. We bring him home to his father's house. His life's labors—as are theirs—well done, these noble men—brothers all—like brethren shall enjoy together the surcease of that noontide which intervenes between things mortal and the immortal life which follows resurrection. We place him beneath the protecting folds of the ensign of our country, the flag of freedom—the flag of a nation which represents in its future destiny, as in its past history, more for the welfare of humanity than any emblem ever swept by the breezes of heaven. Fully conscious of the greatness of those in whose company we place him, Georgia feels neither hesitation nor abashment. He will stand among peers, but here he is the equal of any.

It may be said that he was only a modest physician in a small, though cultured, country town. It may be thought that from a long line of statesmen and soldiers, who have added luster to her name, the imperial Commonwealth of the South might have chosen her representatives upon this floor.

The youngest daughter of the original thirteen has given to this Union many men of superabundant worth. In statesmanship William H. Crawford, John Forsyth, John McPherson Berrien, Walter T. Colquitt, Robert Toombs, Benjamin H. Hill were all men of national reputation. She has furnished to the Supreme Court of the United States three justices. Two of her sons have presided as Speakers of the National House of Representatives. In one administration or another Georgians have filled all of the original seats in the Cabinet of the President of the United States. In arms the services of Georgians have not been less conspicuous. From Lacklan McIntosh to John B. Gordon, from the Revolutionary period until the close of the late World War, in no war in which Old Glory has been unfurled has Georgia courage and Georgia talent ever failed. It was, therefore, not for lack of statesmen or martial heroes that the General Assembly of Georgia selected to perpetuate for all time the memory of him whose statue stands before us.

By the decree of Almighty God the great men who shall in this hall of fame keep company with him did service for this our great Nation of incomparable and everlasting value. Human thoughts can not compass, nor can speech befittingly express the golden debt of gratitude which every true American will freely and joyously accord them in return. To some of them, all citizens of these sovereign but United States owe our independence from foreign rule or foreign domination; to others in this hall of fame we owe the Constitution, which alike nurtures all its children with one hand, while with the other it justly and sternly represses any attempted invasion by the powerful upon the rights of the weak.

To others in this great company of stony silence all of us now acknowledge an everlasting debt for the preservation of the Union. And equally much do patriotic Americans now and for all time hereafter owe to those matchless spirits of the North who, joining the gallant heroes of the gray in the godlike fraternal spirit of the martyred Lincoln, properly at last reconstructed this Union. Not a reconstruction of revenge and hate, of superiority on the one hand and of subordinate inferiority on the other, but a reconstruction in the equality of a brotherhood of the full blood, to the end that we enjoy for all time that peace for which General Grant prayed, and thus bring true the matchless words of yonder Webster when he said, "Liberty and Union, one and inseparable, now and forever."

The services of these, though priceless, were confined by national boundaries. But the service of him to whom we consecrate this shaft is world-wide. Under whatever skies pain and suffering may be found, from the Arctic to the Antarctic Zone, from the barren Steppes of Siberia or the frozen fields of Labrador to where the wild winds of the south sweep the inhospitable shores of Tierra del Fuego, the discovery of Long comes as a panacea to soothe human suffering and woe. No calculation can be made which can compute the value of the services this Georgian gave to humanity. Ordinarily those who fight, wage war under and have a flag and only one, the flag of their particular country. The cause to which Doctor Long contributed is the same everywhere, a single common cause—relief from pain. I deem it, therefore, most appropriate that this great discoverer should be a Georgian. It is most fitting that Georgia, from her great store of great men, proudly should have selected this great discoverer as her worthy representative in this assemblage of the sister States.

The discovery of Doctor Long was not made nor used in the pursuit of wealth. No sordid stain seared spotless science in his search. As he frequently remarked when efforts were being made to have Congress reward pecuniarily the discoverer of anesthesia, this uncrowned monarch of medicine, this conqueror of pain, desired to be considered only as a benefactor to man.

It can be truly said that the scope of Long's beneficence is wider than that of any benefactor in the realm of scientific and medical discovery who has appeared in the history of medical science since the discovery of America. Georgia is the State of benevolence. Unlike other States on the Atlantic coast, the settlement of Georgia upon Yamacraw Bluff by Oglethorpe was solely and purely an act of benevolence. The settlers were taken from the debtor's jails, in which they hopelessly languished, and given a new chance in life, without any hope on the part of the proprietors of the colony of pecuniary reward or emolument therefor. How fitting, then, it is that from the State thus founded should have come he who freely gave the discovery for the alleviation of pain in childbirth and surgery, which was probably the greatest desideratum in that era of medical science and the value of which was destined to last forever. If Harvey is entitled to immortal fame because he discovered the circulation of the blood, if Galileo and Jenner merit immortality, no less will suffering humanity throughout the world, as long as pain and suffering endure, acclaim the name of him who enabled the physician to say in imitation of the Great Physician, and yet without blasphemy, "He giveth His beloved sleep."

For another reason, too, it is well that Georgia should have selected Long to stand with the great commoner, Alexander H. Stephens, as the most distinguished of her sons. His personal character and his private life were such as to add to, instead of detract from his great discovery. He stands here as a model of the clean, cultured, courtly, Christian, Chesterfield—the real southern gentleman. Ofttimes in history private virtues blurred great genius. Nelson had his Lady Hamilton; Byron, Burns, and Shelley were subject to human frailties that their most ardent admirers can but regret. Even Alexander the Great was intemperate, and Solomon, after building the temple of Almighty God, reared altars of idolatry to please his numerous wives. But Long, the great discoverer, who gave the world the antidote for pain, rests not beneath a single shadow which can affect the perfect purity of his life as an ideal citizen, brother, husband, friend, or counselor. His life was pure and gentle, and in him the elements did so mix that all the world could say he was a man. He sprang from good old Revolutionary stock. Both his maternal and paternal grandfathers saw service during the entire Revolution of 1776 to 1781. He belonged to that great host—in peace indispensable, in war invincible—upon whose perpetuation in their pristine purity hangs the destiny of this Union and the preservation of human liberty.

Doctor Long sprang from that great class who owned their homes, as did his forebears before him, and if one can love his country at all, the fires of patriotism must burn far more brighter in the heart of him who has an ownership and a proprietary interest of that portion of his country he loves as his home. And as he stands here through future generations he will illustrate the value of good, pure breeding, independent thought, but gentle bearing, spotless life, and devotion to humanity, that will make an impression no less uplifting and helpful to the thoughtful visitor than the thoughts evoked by any of the great men centered here.

The medical department of the University of Pennsylvania, of which Doctor Long was a graduate, years ago placed in everdurable bronze a memorial in her classic halls to the great discovery which the youthful Georgian made in little more than three years after his graduation.

As chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Georgia, I have been directed to bespeak also in behalf of that dear mother—his alma mater—the feelings of pride and gratification that this day warms her mother's heart. The heart of a mother is not sordid seeking amassment of wealth, nor distracted by the bickerings of politics, nor swollen with mere desire for victory on land or sea or in the air. The soul of a mother yearns for gentler and more unselfish virtues. To her the drying of a single tear has more of honest fame than shedding seas of gore. In her inspiration for service, the soothing of the pangs of pain gives more worthy honor than any crown of bays ere placed upon a victor's brow, and so as this mortal effigy of her son is well and fitly placed among the immortals of his dear and native land, the voice of alma mater says, it is well. It is well the sculptor's skill that gives the liveliness of life and likeness through which he ever shall live depicts him in his youth. In him youth triumphed, for at scarcely 27 he substituted for the pangs of pain, peaceful rest, for the anguish of agony, anesthesia. It is well, for science and truth live in eternal youth which neither time can wither nor death decay. The stone which is the representative of his physical body was taken from the precious bosom of his mother Georgia. And alma mater says, It is well. As this stone came close from her heart, so it typifies the purity of his life, the unselfishness of his aspirations and the genuineness of his right as the real discoverer.

It is well, too, says alma mater, that the grand, everlasting sentinels of Georgia's marble mountains should in loving complaisance gladly yield this memorial to old Georgia's son. The everlasting foundations on which they stand will well depict the strong and immutable hold which the character and services of Crawford W. Long will ever have in the minds and hearts of his fellow citizens. In her earliest infancy our imperial Commonwealth, Georgia, inscribed upon her seal of State her thought and ideals as to the essentials of good government in the three words, "Wisdom, justice, and moderation." The University of Georgia, alma mater of Crawford W. Long, after having herself rejoiced for more than fourscore years in the magnitude of the blessing given the whole world by her worthy son, acclaims this event as an instance of justice long delayed but at length secure.

In this, our Nation's holiest shrine, pious hands and loving hearts from each sovereign State offer the fragrant sacrifice of strong yet sweet devotion. The mother instinct of each Commonwealth has chosen from her sons the chiefest in service and the kings in the kingdom of minds. Here place we Long. And sculpture in our behalf gives bond in stone to guard him and immortalize the trust. The State which first gave the world the hymn book, the Sunday school, the orphan's home, the State university, the woman's college, the cotton gin, the sewing machine, the State whose marble shines in the sunlight of many sections of this Union as the buttresses of art, as the walls of justice and of legislation, adds to this galaxy of the great him whose discovery blesses without distinction all countries and climes, all races, and all religions.

A benefactor of humanity whose beneficence no mountains or rivers or seas or natural boundary lines can exclude, a benefactor whose discovery in 1842 will be greater in 3842 and much multiplied in 10042. 'Tis well. The plaudits we now feebly utter, the grand pipe organ of the distant centuries will peal forth in crescendo notes of praise and these will be reechoed in the paeans of paradise in memory of Long.

In the spirit of that justice which her seal proclaims, old Georgia knows that had no memorial been erected by human hands, in the just verdict of the future Crawford W. Long would have lived in memory. But as error ceases to be dangerous when truth is free to combat it, the memorial we place to-day bears witness to the victory of truth over error and misinformation. And alma mater says 'tis well. The hoarse notes of the massive waves that roll upon our seagirt coast chime with the silvery tinkle of our mountain brooks in cadence with the mother's voice, it is well. And the gentle zephyrs of his native hills pause for an instant as they pass his resting place and whisper in his sleeping ears, Your mother loves you.

Here travelers from every land will look upon a friend of man. They will see in him exemplified for all time that spirit of self-sacrificing and unselfish devotion which, as it most largely contributes to the most urgent needs of all the world, is indeed the highest worship of Almighty God.

For myself, may I be permitted to add—

No radiant pearl which crested fortune wears,
No sparkling gem which hangs from beauty's ear,
Nor the bright stars that the blue arch of night adorn
Nor rising suns which gild the vernal morn
Shines with such luster" as the smile which lights the face
Of grateful mother who's just given to her race,
In painless peace, a boy well worth her tender care
Or a bright girl of mind and heart and beauty rare.
Her frail body for fierce conflict had been staged
With pangs of hell, and dread forebodings all her thoughts engaged.
Tortured in body, racked in mind, ether ends the contest cruel
And wife and mother wakes, to kiss and clasp the prize—her jewel.
And yet, but for Long, the conqueror of pain
Death had prevailed, and turned to dust these twain.
Had marked the fond features with emblem of despair
And snatched from helpless babe its vital air.
The heedless multitudes to wealth or pomp may bow,
May idolize success, achieved no matter how;
Swept by propaganda's current millions meekly yield,
Acclaim some new-found hero, or glorify the tented field.
Invention may our joys or comforts season;
Legislation may our burdens lessen,
The law by statutes may new crimes define,
And education mold and fire the common mind.
But our suffering race to Long's discovery owes
Relief afforded by no human laws.

Doctor BOLAND. It was the intention to have this statue presented to the United States of America by Hon. Clifford Walker, the Governor of Georgia; but unfortunately he is unable to be here. He has sent us a most acceptable substitute in the person of Hon. George M. Napier, attorney general of the State of Georgia, who will present the statue for the State of Georgia.

ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE M. NAPIER, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman, daughters of Doctor Long, my fellow countrymen: Though sensible of the disappointment that Governor Walker, of Georgia,

is prevented from attending in person, it is my privilege to speak for him and for my State in these exercises.

In this national Pantheon we are presenting the statue of the discoverer of the supreme earthly benefaction to suffering humanity. This is a Valhalla of memorials and immortals, including the statues and effigies of warriors, statesmen, orators, inventors, humanitarians, but none such as this, which will perpetuate the ineffable glory of world-wide mercy.

Crawford W. Long, the physician, mindful of the terrible agony of sufferers in surgical operations, discovered an anesthetic and an analgesic, that agency which at once renders the patient unconscious of being handled and completely insensible of pain. If we reflect how many millions of people had suffered the tortures of the damned in treatment for wounds and afflictions in all the years prior to this discovery, and how many have had the terrors of surgery banished during the four and eighty years since Doctor Long accomplished his first anesthetized operation, and if we give rein to our prevision and look down the vistas of coming years at the untold millions more who will escape pain and will live through major operations, made possible only through the use of an anesthetic, we may the better comprehend his illimitable boon to the human race.

If service to humanity be a ground of distinction, then the name of this modest, kind-hearted surgeon, like the name of Abou ben Adhem of old, leads all the rest.

This will be a memorial of unfading perpetuation of the country doctor, that professional who for ages, in thousands of modest communities, has rendered his most unselfish service, content with small rewards, dispensing charity, bearing comfort, inspiring hope, affording relief, and restoring health. None has been like him in serving his day and generation—an exemplar of that Great Physician who on the Judean hills went about doing good.

The State of Georgia is pleased to accept this beautifully carved memorial, whose glory is undimmed by the chaplets on the brow of any figure in this hall of imperishable fame, and it is proud and happy to be the mother of the discoverer of ether anesthesia; her great son, who by his fame distinguished his native State and the Nation, to whom it was given to render this immortal service to his fellow man. So, sir, I am pleased to submit to you, or the Government which you serve as Senator from Georgia, this statue of him who became greatest by doing service and honor, Crawford W. Long. [Great applause.]

Doctor BOLAND. The statue will be accepted for the National Government by a most able and beloved Georgian, to whom we are under many obligations for his activities in perfecting the plans for this unveiling, Senator WILLIAM J. HARRIS, of Georgia. [Applause.]

ACCEPTANCE FOR THE UNITED STATES BY SENATOR WILLIAM J. HARRIS, OF GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman and daughters of Doctor Long, ladies and gentlemen, and fellow Georgians, if anything could intensify the pleasure and pride that I feel to-day in accepting for our Government the statue of a citizen of Georgia, Dr. Crawford W. Long, who unquestionably was the first to use anesthetics in surgical operations, it is the fact that my father was a Georgia doctor and who practiced his profession for 50 years.

Georgia is not the only State that has honored a physician. The statue of Doctor Gorrie, who discovered the process for the manufacture of artificial ice, was placed in Statuary Hall by our sister State, Florida. I am sure that all Georgians are proud of the fact that Gen. Joseph Wheeler and Dr. J. L. M. Curry, whose statues were placed here by the State of Alabama, and Sequoyah, the Cherokee Indian educator, whose statue was erected here by the State of Oklahoma, were all born in Georgia.

The physicians of the world have contributed to human progress in a measure unexcelled by any other profession. The records, which show that a half century ago the average age at death of people in the United States was about 42 years, and that a year ago it had advanced to about 54, prove beyond all question that the average duration of human life in civilized countries has been extended by 12 years. This does not mean that the life span, which the Bible states is three score years and ten, has been changed, for there are to-day no more people per thousand living beyond 70 than there were 50 years ago. It does mean that there are far more of the children born that reach maturity and live until past middle age, making an average of 12 years added to human life in civilized countries. The credit for most of this added life must, in good reason, be accorded the physicians, who care for the health of the people.

The fundamental aims of the physician are the prolongation of life and the alleviation of human suffering. The use of an anesthetic for surgical operations promoted both these aims in large measure, and its now general use is responsible for a large part of the 12 years added recently to the average human life. This being true, it follows that the discovery of ether was one of the greatest human services ever rendered to mankind, and this by a young country doctor of Georgia. We had well be proud of that eminent fact. Men with great minds

have searched down the ages for the agency that would banish suffering during surgical operation.

I am especially proud to accept in the name of the United States Government the statue to a Georgian whose humanitarianism has revolutionized the practice of surgery and been of untold benefit to mankind.

One who is intimate with Crawford Williamson Long and his family has made the following statement about his life:

"A life so exemplary and full of high ideals as was that of Crawford W. Long was largely the result of heredity and environment.

"The Longs of Ulster, Ireland, were Scotch-Irish Presbyterians and men of prominence. For political reasons they were dispossessed of their lands upon which Samuel Long migrated to America and settled in Carlisle, Pa. He fought through the Revolutionary War and soon after its close came to Georgia as the head of a Presbyterian colony.

"James Long, his son, and the father of Crawford Long, was born in Pennsylvania and received his early education in that State. He was a leader in all public enterprises and by inheritance and sound business judgment became the wealthiest man in his district.

"Although a merchant and planter he was so thoroughly versed in jurisprudence that his intimate friend, William H. Crawford, who was minister to France and once a candidate for President of the United States, and for whom his son Crawford was named, often consulted him upon legal technicalities. James Long held many offices of trust such as clerk of the superior court, member of the legislature, State senate, etc. Of a studious nature and the possessor of a fine library, he was deeply interested in the education of the masses. He endowed the school in his little town and selected the teachers.

"His four children were sent to Athens to be educated; the sons to the University of Georgia, the daughters to a select boarding school.

"Crawford Long's mother was Elizabeth Ware, of Virginia, the daughter of a large slave owner. One member of her family located in Augusta—Nicholas Ware, who became a United States Senator. The largest county in the State—Ware—was named for him.

"Crawford Long was admitted by special permission at the age of 14 to Franklin College, now University of Georgia, graduating with second honor and A. M. degree, 1835. He attended the medical department of the University of Kentucky and frequently visited the home of Henry Clay, who treated the young Georgian with special consideration, as he was aware that his father was his ardent supporter. In 1839 he graduated from the University of Pennsylvania, going immediately to a New York hospital to perfect himself in surgery, where he remained until August, 1841, when he located temporarily at Jefferson, Ga., after having received the best literary and medical training this country afforded. March 30, 1842, he performed his first surgical operation on a patient anesthetized by the inhalation of sulphuric ether. A few years later he moved to Athens and died in the discharge of his duty at the bedside of a patient, June 16, 1878."

Doctor BOLAND. It is next my privilege to present to you a surgeon of not only national but international reputation—the wonderful instructor, the master surgeon and scientific investigator, Dr. Hugh H. Young, of Johns Hopkins Hospital. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF DR. HUGH H. YOUNG

Mr. Chairman, daughters of Doctor Long, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege to speak for the medical profession of America at the unveiling of the statue of one who was the first to conceive and carry out the greatest boon to suffering humanity.

For in comparison with surgical anesthesia all other contributions to medical science are trivial.

Before anesthesia surgery was a horror. Surgical operations were dreadful ordeals—a hell to the patients, a purgatory to the surgeons. The frightful shrieks from the hospital operating rooms filled those waiting their turn in the wards with terror.

The awful experiences of operative surgery and the attendant high mortality caused the best minds in medicine to avoid operations. Indeed, for centuries the major operations in Europe were left to itinerant butchers, and in England the barber surgeons did the work while the medical profession stood by and vainly tried to assuage the anguish of the patient.

In a letter to the famous surgeon, Sir James Y. Simpson, a patient who had recently lost a leg by amputation thus described his tortures: "The blank whirlwind of emotion, the horror of great despair, and the sense of desertion by God and man, bordering close upon despair, which swept through my mind and overwhelmed my heart I can never forget. I watched all that the surgeon did with a fascinated intensity. I still recall with unwelcome vividness the spreading out of the instruments, the twisting of the tourniquet, the first incision, the fingering of the sawed bone, the sponge pressed on the flap, the tying of blood vessels, the stitching of the skin, and the bloody, dismembered limb lying on the floor. Their memory still haunts me."

But the sufferings of high-minded, sensitive doctors in the midst of this welter of blood and misery were almost as great as those of the poor patients. Many of the most brilliant scions of Aesculapius have told how they have deserted surgery and even quit their cherished profession rather than continue in such heart-rending work.

"How often," says Dr. Valentine Mott (one of America's greatest surgical pioneers), "when operating in some deep, dark wound, along the course of some great vein, with thin walls, alternately distended and flaccid with the vital current—how often have I dreaded that some unfortunate struggle of the patient would deviate the knife a little from its proper course, and that I, who fain would be the deliverer, should involuntarily become the executioner, seeing my patient perish in my hands by the most appalling form of death! Had he been insensible I should have felt no alarm."

The celebrated John Bell in describing the operation for stone says:

"The posture in which the patient is bound is horrible, but essential to the performing of an operation where the slipping of one instrument or the misgiving of one stroke of the knife makes the difference of safety or death. He must be made to grasp his feet with his hands, and secured in that posture by cords encircling the wrists and ankles, and thus bended into a curve, is brought so near to the edge of the table that he is almost suspended in air.

"Three medical assistants should hold him, one on each side; the third assistant should support his head and shoulders and keep him forward according to the operator's directions. A friend should stand by to speak to him, to encourage and to give him occasionally a little wine and water; and everything on the table of instruments should be fairly arranged, and every attendant steady, silent, and observing. When the surgeon, advancing to the table thus arranged, warms the gorget while he grasps the knife and advances to make the lightning cuts which are to complete the operation."

This was the routine in the homes of the rich, where attention de luxe was possible. What was done in the homes of the poor and most of all the operating shambles of the battle field? Amputations were often made with a swift blow of the ax or meat cleaver, followed by a red-hot iron to stanch the flow of blood, as they dared not use ligatures to bind the bleeding arteries for fear of septic poisoning. But what was the medical profession about? Were there no efforts made to conquer pain and to improve surgical technique?

Since the beginning of medical history our records show that the never despairing hope of physicians was to conquer pain and thus be allowed to carry out surgical procedures with tranquil thoroughness rather than in a mad dash against pain and death.

"Sacred, profane, and mythological literature abound in incident, fact, and fancy showing that from earliest times man has sought to assuage pain by some means of dulling consciousness. In these attempts many methods and divers agents have been employed. The inhalation of fumes from various substances, weird incantations, the external and internal application of drugs and many strange concoctions, pressure upon important nerves and blood vessels, the laying on of hands, or animal magnetism, mesmerism, etc., have played their part in the evolution of anesthesia." (Anesthesia, by J. T. Gwathmey.)

Mandragora was used by both Greeks and Romans for hundreds of years to produce sleep, and Asiatics employed hashish to dull consciousness of pain. Later opium and hemlock were used.

It was not until the early chemical discoveries of hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen, and nitrous oxide in the latter part of the eighteenth century that the way was found for a scientific anesthesia. Sir Humphrey Davy said in 1800, "Since nitrous oxide is capable of destroying pain it may be used in surgical operation," and 25 years later Hickman anesthetized rabbits with nitrous oxide and carried out many operations successfully upon them without a struggle. But these demonstrations went unheeded—the surgical theater continued to be a torture chamber!

But nitrous oxide and sulphuric ether, neglected by the medical profession, were seized upon by populace who found in them a pleasant means of becoming exhilarated. Itinerant lecturers on the marvels of chemistry roamed over the country and popularized their meetings by giving the young people ether to breathe while the audiences roared with laughter over their unconscious antics on the stage.

The knowledge of and interest in these drugs reached even to the distant rural hamlets. In one of these, Jefferson, Jackson County, Ga., many miles from a railroad, Crawford W. Long was plying his profession of medicine. Fresh from the University of Pennsylvania, he knew of the exhilarating properties of these drugs and frequently furnished ether to young men who met at his office for an "ether frolic" in the winter of 1841-42. But let him tell his story:

"They were so much pleased with its effects that they afterwards frequently used it and induced others to do the same, and the practice soon became quite fashionable in the county and some of the contiguous counties.

"On numerous occasions I inhaled ether for its exhilarating properties and would frequently, at some short time subsequent to its inhalation, discover bruised or painful spots on my person which I had no recollection of causing and which I felt satisfied were received while under the influence of ether. I noticed my friends while etherized received falls and blows which I believed were sufficient to produce pain on a person not in a state of anesthesia, and on questioning them they uniformly assured me that they did not feel the least pain from these accidents. Observing these facts, I was led to be-

Heve that anesthesia was produced by the inhalation of ether, and that its use would be applicable in surgical operations.

"The first patient to whom I administered ether in a surgical operation was Mr. James M. Venable, who then resided within two miles of Jefferson, and at present lives in Cobb County, Ga., Mr. Venable consulted me on several occasions in regard to the propriety of removing two small tumors situate on the back part of his neck but would postpone from time to time having the operation performed, from dread of pain. At length I mentioned to him the fact of my receiving bruises while under the influence of the vapor of ether without suffering, and as I knew him to be fond of and accustomed in inhale ether, I suggested to him the probability that the operations might be performed without pain, and proposed operating on him while under its influence. He consented to have one tumor removed, and the operation was performed the same evening. The ether was given to Mr. Venable on a towel, and when fully under its influence I extirpated the tumor.

"It was encysted and about half an inch in diameter. The patient continued to inhale ether during the time of the operation, and when informed it was over, seemed incredulous until the tumor was shown him.

"He gave no evidence of suffering during the operation, and assured me, after it was over, that he did not experience the least degree of pain from its performance. This operation was performed on the 30th of March, 1842."

Here, then, was the first successful attempt to render a patient insensible to pain during a surgical operation! The beginning of a new era of incalculable relief of human suffering—an era which was to revolutionize surgery and make it a million times more efficient in alleviating human ills.

Long did not rush into print, but like a painstaking, modest scientist, quietly continued his work, removing another tumor on the same patient a few weeks later, and then amputating a toe under complete ether anesthesia in July.

After that, his meager practice only furnished him a few surgical cases each year which he continued to operate upon under ether, while he bided his time, waiting for a major operation before publishing his claims to a discovery which he well realized would revolutionize surgery and startle the world. Long thus succinctly gives his motives:

"I was anxious, before making my publication, to try etherization in a sufficient number of cases to fully satisfy my mind that anesthesia was produced by the ether, and was not the effect of the imagination or owing to any peculiar insusceptibility to pain in the persons experimented on.

"At the time I was experimenting with ether there were physicians high in authority and of justly distinguished character who were the advocates of mesmerism, and recommended the induction of the mesmeric state as adequate to prevent pain in surgical operations. Notwithstanding thus sanctioned, I was an unbeliever in the science, and of the opinion that if the mesmeric state could be produced at all it was only on those of strong imaginations and weak minds, and was to be ascribed solely to the workings of the patient's imagination. Entertaining this opinion, I was the more particular in my experiments in etherization.

"Surgical operations are not of frequent occurrence in a country practice, and especially in the practice of a young physician; yet I was fortunate enough to meet with two cases in which I could satisfactorily test the anesthetic power of ether. From one of these patients I removed three tumors the same day; the inhalation of ether was used only in the second operation, and was effectual in preventing pain, while the patient suffered severely from the extirpation of the other tumors. In the other case I amputated two fingers of a negro boy; the boy was etherized during one amputation and not during the other; he suffered from one operation and was insensible during the other.

"After fully satisfying myself of the power of ether to produce anesthesia, I was desirous of administering it in a severer surgical operation than any I had performed. In my practice, prior to the published account of the use of ether as an anesthetic, I had no opportunity of experimenting with it in a capital operation, my cases being confined, with one exception, to the extirpation of small tumors and the amputation of fingers and toes.

"While cautiously experimenting with ether, as cases occurred, with a view of fully testing its anesthetic powers and its applicability to severe as well as minor surgical operations, others more favorably situated engaged in similar experiments, and consequently the publication of etherization did not 'bide my time.'

"I know that I deferred the publication too long to receive any honor from the priority of discovery, but having by the persuasion of my friends presented my claim before the profession, I prefer that its correctness be fully investigated before the Medical Society. Should the society say that the claim, though well founded, is forfeited by not being presented earlier, I will cheerfully respond, so mote it be.

"Not wishing to intrude upon the time of the society, I have made this short compendium of all the material points stated in my article in the journal, and if the society wishes any further information on the subject I will cheerfully comply with their wishes."

But are Long's documents genuine, complete, and convincing? I can personally testify that they are. In 1896, I chanced to meet Mrs. Fanny Long Taylor, who amazed me by saying that her father was the discoverer of surgical anesthesia. I had heard only of Morton in whose honor as the "discoverer of anesthesia" a great celebration was in preparation in Boston. I was thrilled when she said she could put Doctor Long's documentary proofs in my hands, and when a few days later I hurried through his time-stained papers, case-histories, account books, affidavits from patients, attendants, physicians in his town and elsewhere in Georgia—all of which furnished overwhelming proof of the originality of his discovery and his successful employment of ether to produce complete anesthesia in numerous operations, I asked permission to present again his claims in greater detail.

On looking into the literature I found that the great Dr. Marion Sims had ardently asserted that Long undoubtedly had done the first operation under ether anesthesia—antedating the work of Morton at the Massachusetts General by four years. Unfortunately Sims paper was distorted by a serious misstatement—he gave the credit for the idea of using ether to a Doctor Wilhite, one of Long's medical students, from whom Sims learned of Long's work. Wilhite's story was disproved by a letter from Wilhite which I found among the Long papers, in which he, Wilhite, admitted his "mistake" in making this claim.

I found also that Morton's son had vigorously assailed Long's methods, asserting that complete anesthesia was not produced; that the ether was used as at the "ether frolics"; that the patient "administered ether to himself and remained conscious all the time."

By happy fortune I found one of Doctor Long's assistants still alive, and he (Dr. J. F. Groves) described how "Doctor Long poured ether on a towel and held it to the patient's nose and mouth * * * and determined when the patient was sufficiently etherized to begin operation by pinching him, and then gave me the towel, and I kept up the influence by holding it still to the patient's nose. The patient was entirely unconscious." (Given in detail in Long, the Discoverer of Anesthesia—a presentation of his original documents by Hugh H. Young, the Johns Hopkins Hospital Bulletin, August, 1898.) The Wilhite story of priority of idea, advanced by Sims, I was able to disprove by a letter from Wilhite himself, which admitted his "mistake."

Lack of time forbids my describing many interesting phases of the contest for the honor of this colossal discovery. Jackson and Morton, who obtained a patent for their "discovery" (the nature of the anesthetic, which they called "letheon," being kept secret) on the basis of Jackson's giving Morton the idea, and Morton using it on the first cases (dental), subsequently disagreed, and Doctor Jackson hearing of Long's claims, visited him in Georgia to investigate them and then generously wrote as follows:

BOSTON, Thursday, April 11, 1861.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

MESSRS. EDITORS: At the request of the Hon. Mr. Dawson, United States Senator from Georgia, on March 8, 1854, I called upon Dr. C. W. Long, of Athens, Ga. From the documents shown me by Doctor Long it appears that he employed sulphuric ether as an anesthetic agent:

First. March 30, 1842, when he extirpated a small glandular tumor from the neck of James M. Venable, a boy in Jefferson, Ga., now dead.

Second. July 3, 1842, in the amputation of the toe of a negro boy belonging to Mrs. Hemphill, of Jackson, Ga.

Third. September 9, 1843, in extirpation of a tumor from the head of Mary Vincent, of Jackson, Ga.

Fourth. January 8, 1845, in the amputation of a finger of a negro boy belonging to Ralph Bailey, of Jackson, Ga.

Copies of the letters and depositions proving these operations with ether were all shown me by Doctor Long.

I then called on Profs. Joseph and John Le Conte, then of the University of Georgia, at Athens, and inquired if they knew Doctor Long and what his character was for truth and veracity. They both assured me that they knew him well and that no one who knew him in that town would doubt his word, and that he was an honorable man in all respects.

Subsequently, on revisiting Athens, Doctor Long showed me his folio journal, or account book, in which stand the following entries:

James Venable:	
March 30, 1842, ether and excising tumor-----	\$2.00
May 13, sul. ether-----	25
June 6, excising tumor-----	2.00

On the upper half of the same page several charges for ether sold to the teacher of the Jefferson Academy are recorded, which ether Doctor Long told me was used by the teacher in exhibiting its exhilarating effects, and he said the boys used it for the same purpose in the academy. I observed that all these records bore the appearance of old and original entries in the book.

I have waited, expecting Doctor Long to publish his statements and evidence in full, and therefore have not before published what I learned from him. He is a very modest, retiring man, and not disposed to bring his claims before any but a medical or scientific tribunal.

Had he written to me in season I would have presented his claim to the Academy of Sciences of France, but he allowed his case to go by default, and the academy knew no more of his claims to the practical use of ether in surgical operations than I did.

CHARLES T. JACKSON, M. D.

BOSTON, April 3, 1861.

Long's claims were therefore shown to rest on solid evidence. He had produced complete anesthesia by ether which he personally administered, had operated painlessly, and on several cases four years before anyone else. He had not kept his anesthetic secret, but had told fellow physicians of his town and State of his work. By strange coincidence Morton did not publish his epoch-making cases, but it remained for one who had not even done the operations, Dr. H. J. Bigelow, to become his mouthpiece and advocate in the sad spectacle of litigation and controversy between the rival New England claimants for a bonus from Congress for the discovery of anesthesia. In this Doctor Long took no part, but a presentation of his documents by Senator Dawson, of Georgia, promptly killed the bill to give Morton \$100,000.

On March 30, 1912, on the seventieth anniversary of his first operation, a great celebration was staged at his alma mater—the University of Pennsylvania—in honor of Long's discovery of anesthesia.

That the general usage of ether in surgery came after the surgeons of the Massachusetts General Hospital had operated upon cases anesthetized by Morton no one will gainsay. But in this epoch-making discovery and the general adoption of anesthesia there is surely "glory enough for all."

I have already consumed so much time that little can be told of the immense benefit which promptly accrued to surgery and to humanity by the discovery of anesthesia.

Surgery was unshackled, physicians returned to the operating table, the shrieks of the torture chamber ceased, and the operating amphitheater became a place of quiet scientific endeavor to master the ravages of disease with the humane use of the knife. Conditions, heretofore hopeless, were brought under the sway of surgery; surgeons rapidly acquired a daring, a dexterity, and exquisite skill that has resulted in the most amazing progress witnessed in any art.

Before anesthesia, only 34 cases a year were operated on at the Massachusetts General. In five years the number had tripled, and in 50 years the increase was a hundredfold.

In the surgical textbooks before 1842 one finds described only minor procedures and emergency operations. Within 10 years the changes wrought were immense; splendid new conquests over disease by surgery were reported. The advance was rapid, but not until Pasteur's great work on spontaneous generation (1862) and diseases of silkworms in 1865 and Lister's announcement of his discovery of surgical antiseptics in 1867 was the capstone placed upon Long's work of 15 years before. Surgery was delivered from the horrors of pain and infection, and, like an animal freed from a black dungeon of despair, bounded forth into the pure light of science.

Disease, now explained by the germ theory, rapidly fell before one masterful research after another, while surgeons boldly went forth to conquer the hidden terrors of the abdomen, the chest, the brain, and every corner of the human organism was finally brought under the searching rays of scientific medicine.

Without the gift of anesthesia where would we be to-day? Accustomed as we are to behold the wonderful accomplishments of modern medicine and surgery with complacency, what a tumult would ensue were we to revert again to the days of the great discoverer whose memory we celebrate to-day in the unveiling of this splendid replica of Crawford Williamson Long.

Doctor BOLAND. The great State of Pennsylvania could well claim a part in the production of Doctor Long as well as the State of Georgia, in as much as Doctor Long graduated in medicine from the splendid medical department of that venerable institution in 1839.

In the regretted absence of Senator PEPPER, his place will be taken by the vice provost of the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. George William McClellan. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF DR. GEORGE W. MCCLELLAN

Mr. President, daughters of Doctor Long, ladies, and gentlemen, in the unavoidable absence of Senator PEPPER, our distinguished alumnus, it is my pleasure to be the spokesman of the University of Pennsylvania in joining in this tribute to our great alumnus.

Those of us who are fairly acquainted with the problems in the life of the university of to-day must needs for our encouragement and inspiration pause occasionally and look across the years into the past. The university which I represent stretches back 186 years into the history of our country and is inseparably connected with its development.

There are no scales of measurement by which one may calculate what the alumni of any college or university, across the space of years, has contributed toward the relief of human suffering and the prolongation of human life. We are very proud that we can join with the University of Georgia in claiming Doctor Long as one of our sons. We are proud of the fact that he went out from our medical school, and as a practicing physician made this great discovery for the relief of human suffering.

It gives me pleasure, in behalf of our provost, Doctor Pennyman, to present these flowers to the ladies of Doctor Long's family in recognition of their faithful, loyal devotion to his memory, and to the putting of the truth before mankind. [Applause.]

On behalf of our alumni in the city of Washington I wish to present this wreath in tribute to the memory of our distinguished alumnus, who has given an illustration to all Pennsylvania men of an ideal spirit. [Applause.]

Doctor BOLAND. Crawford Long was one of the charter members of the Medical Association of Georgia, which was organized in 1849, at which time he presented his first paper on this subject before its body.

One of the very young associates of Doctor Long—at this time it is hard to believe that he was an associate, when we look at him—in the latter days of the life of Doctor Long was a young physician who was destined to become a leader in the profession in later years. This man I have the honor to introduce to you now, one who has done much to perpetuate the fame of Doctor Long, Dr. L. G. Hardman, speaking for the Medical Association of Georgia.

RESPONSE BY DR. L. G. HARDMAN FOR THE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman, Doctor Long's daughters, Senators, Congressmen, ladies, and gentlemen, before I undertake to present my short paper to you I wish to call to your attention this fact, that our distinguished physician and surgeon from Johns Hopkins has given the credit to a foreigner, if I may so term it, to Sir Joseph Lister, as the discoverer of antiseptic surgery. I propose to present to you in my paper another Georgian who did antiseptic surgery and taught it prior to 1867—in the sixties—during the war between the States.

The honor and privilege has been granted me to represent the Medical Association of Georgia on this occasion. Indeed, it is a great joy and gratification to be permitted to be present, bringing with me the hearts and souls of all Georgians, who feel so grateful for the discovery made by one of her sons, Dr. Crawford W. Long, who has contributed so much to the world.

Dr. Crawford W. Long was a charter member of the Medical Association of Georgia, which was organized March 20, 1849. Other members of the association who stand out as pioneers in medical science are Dr. L. D. Ford, of Augusta, the first president of this association and who was first to advocate quinine for the cure of malaria, and Dr. L. A. Dugas, of Augusta, the discoverer of mesmeric anesthesia and gave to the world antiseptic surgery; he was also first to advocate laparotomy for gunshot wounds in his famous paper read before the International Medical Congress in Philadelphia in 1876. The works of these still live to bless humanity.

The great physician and Georgian, Dr. Crawford W. Long, was in touch with the burdens and responsibilities of the doctors of this organization, and with his humble, gentle, and sweet disposition was often enabled by his advice and wise counsel to lift the weight of the burden from his fellow doctor in many ways as well as in the practice of his profession. I can not express to you the great esteem and appreciation in which he was held by his coworkers in his noble profession. This organization is here in spirit, in love, and joy to witness the high honor that is now being conferred upon him, one of its most distinguished members. His highest ambition was to serve humanity. Several years elapsed before the world began to know of his discovery. However, his friends and neighbor doctors were enthusiastic over his discovery and works. While that is true, the administration of sulphuric ether and his teachings were contributing untold relief to the world. But to-day God smiles upon this gathering as we lift the veil from his statue. He was a follower of the lowly Nazarene who came into the world to destroy sin and relieve pain. The climax in his work was reached when he discovered sulphuric ether as an anesthetic. I wish the members of this association who have crossed the great beyond could have lived to witness the erection of this statue to the memory of Doctor Long, especially Dr. Howard Williams, who gave an expression in a paper read before the Medical Association of Georgia on its fiftieth anniversary, from which I quote:

"Of these, one truly great, one name sublime,
Will ring with praise, so long as art and time
Shall last—and men grow ill—Crawford W. Long.
May his fair name resound in prose and song
While ether robs the surgeon's knife
Of its sharp edge, which wounds in saving life;
Unrivalled merit his to ether's fame,
Yet this renown others unjustly claim.
Be ours the task, with credit to unroll
His honor just one fame's eternal scroll;
Nor let this day the flaming sun go down
Until a fund begins with which to crown
His grand success in marble white or brass
Of statue great, so all may see who pass,
And the unnumbered many thousands can
With ringing voice exclaim, behold the man
Whom God the ethereal art hath showed
Once used when Eve on Adam was bestowed."

The claimants, Dr. Charles T. Jackson, W. T. G. Morton, and Wells, deserve credit for their research and their use of anesthesia and we would be glad if they, too, could be placed here in company with Crawford W. Long. Their spirits no doubt mingle in company in the world beyond, and converse in an invisible way in this Statuary Hall.

We have in the United States 7,370 hospitals with a capacity of 813,926 beds, and to indicate to some degree the contribution he has made to humanity, I have attempted to secure from various institutions, namely, the University of Pennsylvania, College of Physicians and Surgeons of New York, Johns Hopkins Hospital, the National Government in Washington, and the American Medical Association, the number of anesthetics that are given daily, not only in this country but in the world, but we find no records. Johns Hopkins reports 4,235 in a year; the Hospital Library and Service Bureau estimates 3,000,000 in the United States yearly, and with this estimate I have reached the conclusion that out of the population of 113,493,720 in the United States, 2.6 per cent are anesthetized yearly; on the same basis or percentage, 42,448,000 are anesthetized yearly in the world. This will, to some extent, indicate the great service and relief to human suffering. Not only that, but it has made possible the radical cure by the surgeon's procedure which heretofore they were unable to do. In fact, in medical science, and surgery especially, it has been made possible for the eye of the surgeon to look on the interior of the human body while the patient is under the influence of the anesthesia, and with a trained eye remove diseased and injured tissues that before were never known to the world. All repairs from accidents, injuries, and gunshot wounds in the great World War and other wars, made it possible to save life, preserve limbs, and restore health, which the world can only appreciate in the great progress in medical science.

I would not pass by without noticing those in the Statuary Hall in whose company he has been placed; to them I would say that while you have passed to your reward, yet you live and speak for each State and each section the principles for which you lived and are here to bear witness to; Abraham Lincoln, who speaks for the abolition of slavery, union of States, and freedom of man; Miss Frances E. Willard, who speaks for the conservation of the character and souls of men and the abolition of the liquor traffic, his greatest enemy; J. L. M. Curry, who was born in Georgia, stands for the abolition of ignorance, the great foe of the world; Thomas H. Benton, Daniel Webster, and John C. Calhoun, who stirred the world with their wisdom and oratory, in whose company he has been placed; Ulysses S. Grant and Kirby Smith, representing the conquerors of this great Union as warriors; and Robert E. Lee, the ideal soldier and general—the conqueror of passion and prejudice of men, and others; all stand here to impress the ages with their purity and their contributions to the world. It is in their company and in this great National Capitol we rejoice in being recognized by the world for the services rendered by Crawford W. Long, the discoverer of sulphuric ether as an anesthetic. He has come to live with you for all time, presenting to the world his discovery as a destroyer of human pain. [Applause.]

Doctor BOLAND. This occasion would not be complete unless we heard from the only woman Senator in the world, that remarkable lady whom we all love so well, one whose interest in the welfare of her people never flags, former Senator Rebecca Latimer Felton, of Georgia. [Applause.]

RESPONSE BY REBECCA LATIMER FELTON, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM GEORGIA

Beloved daughters of Doctor Long, Senators, Congressmen, and this goodly company assembled here to do honor to Georgia, the greatest mystery of human existence is the birth of a little child. It will always rank as a miracle to the searcher after truth.

Why the Almighty Creator of heaven and of earth selected the woman to insure the care and the affection of the mother to the little one in the most critical period of its early existence has never been explained to me by Bible or by science; but the fact remains that the woman was thus selected, thus emphasized, and mother love comes next to the Divine love in the story of every human life. This relation of the mother to the unborn child is universal, for every child has had its own mother.

In the Bible story of Adam and Eve the latter was penalized for disobedience by the travail of mind and body in the pains of childbirth. In this connection it is meet and proper to-day to emphasize and eulogize the discovery of an antidote for such physical and mental suffering when the pangs of maternity were unavoidable.

From a viewpoint of over 90 years, it is my privilege and my pleasure to bring to your attention the almost universal use and the importance of Doctor Long's discovery to the child-bearing women of the world. How many women, in the previous years, found their own death struggle joined to the death struggle of the child, can never be known. Such a chronicle, or such statistics, would be impossible. Therefore, how beautiful are the feet of those that brought glad tidings and a surcease from pain, until the mother could welcome her

baby to her own arms with relief from acute suffering; and there is no light on land or sea like that light from the eyes of the mother who can take her baby to her heart and feel that her baby is safe and normal, and equipped for future existence, and that she also is a monument of God's saving mercy to be its nearest and dearest friend.

This hall of fame is largely occupied by military heroes. Time would fail me to elaborate the extent of America's devotion to her war heroes; but in this presence, and before this goodly company, we come here as Georgians to pay tribute to a distinguished Georgian who led the way into the greatest discovery known to all the ages, for this surcease of pain when the child first sees the light of day.

Because you love the name and the memory of your mother, just as I love the name and memory of my mother, by this token I ask you to pay respect and honor to this farseeing inventor, or this discoverer, or this explorer, just as you please, Dr. Crawford Long, of the State of Georgia; and may I not offer this little tribute from those of Georgia, in the name of the motherhood of all America. [Applause.]

Doctor BOLAND. We are delighted to have on the program to-day a worthy representative of the modern anesthetist, who is here to pay tribute to the first anesthetist. I present Dr. William Hamilton Long, of Louisville, Ky., secretary of the Southern Association of Anesthetists.

Doctor LONG. Mr. Chairman, daughters of Doctor Long, and members of the Crawford W. Long Memorial Association, ladies and gentlemen, permit me at the outset to say that I deeply appreciate the honor of the recognition accorded the Southern Association of Anesthetists at this historic event. It is as a representative of that body that I appear before you to add our mite to the great wealth of love, of honor, of respect, of tribute, of glory, all long delayed, that here to-day are laid at the feet of this great man.

For he was truly great. The very primary essentials of true greatness, the very fundamental attributes of this rare quality are the outstanding features of Crawford Long's character—humility, modesty, unselfishness. While false claimants of the honor so rightfully his wrangled and quarreled, he remained serene and supreme. Quietly, unostentatiously he continued his work. To one with his conception of ethical standards the idea of entering such a controversy was repugnant. It was beneath the dignity of a physician; it was out of keeping with the delicate and charming code of honor and of custom that obtained among gentlemen in the South.

Crawford Long wished merely to find the truth. Probably he felt that in the full measure of time, the truth, the honor, and the credit would be properly adjusted. His primary concern was not with fame, and less, far less with rewards of gold. He wooed no such fickle goddesses, nor was deviated by their siren calls from the simple path of duty which lay before him. Straight, clear-cut, and well defined. He was busy, and with the enthusiasm of the ministry of his profession; with the satisfaction of a loved physician who is successfully alleviating suffering and relieving pain, he left his place as a pioneer in medicine, his heritage of fame to the future, to posterity. That he had emblazoned his name in the golden letters that spell suffering's surcease and pain's assuagement, he no doubt knew.

That he had placed it with that of Jenner, of McDowell, of Sims, I make no doubt he realized, but it was no part of his duty as he conceived it to sound the trumpets heralding his achievement. With beautiful modesty, he left that to a later generation. Not until others appeared claiming his honor was he prevailed upon to present his data. And how simply he rose to refute the claims of those whose moving force was greed; whose every effort was directed toward a recognition that would take the form of gold. He held himself aloof from those who would capitalize, commercialize a discovery that has been mankind's greatest boon. In all the archives of history, general, religious, or scientific, there is no incident that more beautifully reflects the true character of a great man than does Crawford Long's simple statement of his own attitude in the unsavory controversy which his unworthy rivals had instigated: "My only wish about it is to be regarded as the benefactor of my race." There is concentrated in a sentence the code of a doctor and the character of a gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this occasion, sublime and noble in its purpose, immortal in its memory, should cause the heart of every human being on earth to overflow anew with grateful sentiment for Crawford Long.

The man whose genius transformed the revelry of irresponsible youth into a triumphant victory over a terror that was second only to death; who changed the operating theater from a shambles into a shining beacon light of hope; who made the scalpel an emblem of mercy where once it had been an implement of torture, comes to-day into his own. On an anniversary of the day his boon came to drive from surgery its agony we come, weakly and tardily, to do him that honor, to give to his memory that tribute so long overdue.

Truth travels but a sluggish steed, but truth must be served. To-day there is not a household in the civilized world that has not personal reason to revere his memory and to bless his name. No better example exists of the solemnity of the "eternal fitness of things" than is provided by thus enshrining his memory in this hall of hallowed fame. One more illustrious figure has been added to this

proud galaxy of the Nation's great. None in this hall of heroes is more worthy of his place. His native State, sensitive always and responsive to her obligations, has displayed rare wisdom and ripe judgment in selecting her most worthy son to perpetuate her glory through the ages. How fitting that this likeness is hewn from native marble indigenous to his own beloved Georgia. Its ruggedness and its delicacy of texture symbolize alike his character and his sensitive and delicate refinement.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Southern Association of Anesthetists, I beg to extend congratulations to Georgia and to the Crawford W. Long Memorial Association. At its inception this organization pledged its support to any movement that would hasten justice and enshrine the truth. The Southern Association of Anesthetists flings from its masthead Long's likeness. We are proud to be represented here. We are proud to be a witness to this example of truth, oft crushed to earth, rising at last, supreme, defiant. "The wheels of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding fine." Crawford Williamson Long is at last among his peers. [Applause.]

Doctor BOLAND. We have heard the surgeon and the anesthetist, and now comes one who often seems the most important in the sick room, the strong right arm of the medical profession, the trained nurse; God bless her! [Applause.] In placing her last on the program, thoroughly we believe that the last should be best. I have the honor to present Miss Virginia Gibbs, of Atlanta, Ga., speaking for the nurses.

Miss GIBBS. Mr. Chairman; daughters of Doctor Long; ladies and gentlemen, to-day I come to voice the spirit of the daughters of the Southland who wait by the bedside of pain—not only the voice of the nurses of the Southland but the voice of the great army of women who span the globe and watch while others sleep.

In the white, still operating room, in as many hospitals as there are cities in the wide world, silent prayers have gone up to the great God above us in deepest gratitude to Him for placing in the heart and mind of Dr. Crawford Long the beneficent and wonderful discovery of ether anesthesia.

Although with bated breath we nurses stand by the operating table as we watch the skilled hands of the surgeons, we know that peacefully sleeping the patient is being restored to health again without acknowledgment of pain.

In our Army hospitals during the time of the great World War, both in this country and "over there," our hearts crushed by the terror of it all, one bright light shown through the darkness, and that was that pain could be deadened by ether until the surgeons could complete their work.

We are grateful, Doctor Long, for the peace your discovery has brought to our little patients, our brave little patients, the little children who have to undergo operations so that spines may be made straight, limbs be made to walk—so that little bodies may run out with joy into God's beautiful world in the gladness of health.

It is with pride that I can say that fate directed my footsteps to the town of your birth, and there my heart was awed by the thought in our own red hills of Georgia, in a small town far removed from clinics and large hospitals, was born the one destined to bring peace to the suffering, a peace not unlike the soft peace that pervaded the very atmosphere around your homestead.

The nurses in the years to come whose feet shall pass this sacred spot will pause and with the same gratitude that we feel in our hearts to-day will say, "Forever dear will be your memory, Doctor Long, for the inestimable good ether anesthesia has done on earth and will continue to do until the coming of the Great Physician."

I bring a wreath from the Georgia Association of Graduate Nurses to Doctor Long's memory. [Applause.]

Doctor BOLAND. In addition to the wreath just presented from the nurses I would like to call attention to the other wreaths placed here, one from the city of Thomasville, Ga., the birthplace of Crawford Long, one from the University of Georgia, one from the Medical Association of Georgia, and one from the Medical Alumni Association of the University of Pennsylvania, and this one from the Georgia Pharmaceutical Association.

In addition to that I would call your attention to these two gavels, which were loaned for this occasion, which were made from a mulberry tree which stands in front of the building in which Doctor Long first used ether. We thank you for your attention.

CRAWFORD W. LONG

By J. T. Hudson, of Lincolnton, Ga.

Not thine upon the gory front
Where Mars the gage of battle wields;
Where, alas! too oft is wont
That right to might inglorious yields—
Where, in serried ranks arrayed,
Food for shot and shell and blade,
Men as puny pawns are played—
Pawn to ambition, pawn to greed;
Not this, O Georgian, be thy meed.

Nay! 'Twere not thine the gift
To soar in realms of phantasy!
Not thine the boon of song to lift
To rapturous heights of minstrelsy!
Not these—fleet symbols of decay,
Ephemeral tokens of a day,
Not these—the laurel and the bay!
Not so! For thee awaits a nobler lot
Than song unsung and then—forgot.

'Twas not ordained for thee to read
Thy name engrossed upon the page
Where others madly sought to lead!
Ambitions crash and passions rage!
Nay! For inscribed thereon
(The forehead of a skeleton)
Awaits—at last—oblivion!
A meteor's flash—such is fame—
Not this thy goal—an empty name!

Be this thy sole beatitude;
This sculptured tribute to thy worth—
This—the boon of gratitude,
The highest, noblest gift on earth—
For unborn millions yet shall sing—
Prince and peasant both shall bring—
Where'er is pain or suffering—
This grateful plaudit, "Yes; well done,
Georgia's splendid, noble son!"

EDWIN MARKHAM'S POEM "THE MAN WITH THE HOE"

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, this is the anniversary of the birth of Edwin Markham, the well-beloved poet. I therefore ask that his best-known poem, "The Man With the Hoe," be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN WITH THE HOE

(Written after seeing Millet's world-famous painting of a brutalized toiler)

God made man in his own image,
In the image of God made He him.—Genesis.
Bowed by the weight of centuries he leans
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,
The emptiness of ages in his face
And on his back the burden of the world.
Who made him dead to rapture and despair,
A thing that grieves not and that never hopes,
Stolid and stunned, a brother to the ox?
Who loosened and let down this brutal jaw?
Whose was the hand that slanted back this brow?
Whose breath blew out the light within this brain?
Is this the thing the Lord God made and gave
To have dominion over sea and land;
To trace the stars and search the heavens for power;
To feel the passion of Eternity?
Is this the dream He dreamed who shaped the suns
And marked their ways upon the ancient deep?
Down all the caverns of hell to their last gulf
There is no shape more terrible than this—
More tongued with censure of the world's blind greed—
More filled with signs and portents for the soul—
More packed with danger to the universe.
What gulfs between him and the seraphim!
Slave of the wheel of labor, what to him
Are Plato and the swing of Pleiades?
What the long reaches of the peaks of song,
The rift of dawn, the reddening of the rose?
Through this dread shape the suffering ages look;
Time's tragedy is in that aching stoop;
Through this dread shape humanity betrayed,
Plundered, profaned, and disinherited,
Cries protest to the powers that made the world,
A protest that is also prophecy.
O masters, lords and rulers in all lands,
Is this the handiwork you give to God,
This monstrous thing, distorted and soul quenched?
How will you ever straighten up this shape;
Touch it again with immortality;
Give back the upward looking and the light;
Rebuild in it the music and the dream;
Make right the immemorial infamies,
Perfidious wrongs, immedicable woes?
O masters, lords and rulers in all lands,
How will the future reckon with this man?

How answer his brute question in that hour
When whirlwinds of rebellion shake all shores?
How will it be with kingdoms and with kings—
With those who shaped him to the thing he is—
When this dumb terror shall rise to judge the world,
After the silence of the centuries?

(Copyright by Edwin Markham, 1899, 1924.)

THE PROHIBITION LAW

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Bishop James Cannon, jr., chairman of the commission on temperance and social service of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate on the subject of prohibition.

There being no objection, Bishop Cannon's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR., CHAIRMAN OF COMMISSION ON TEMPERANCE AND SOCIAL SERVICE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH SOUTH, BEFORE SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS ON PROHIBITION

I appear before the committee to-day as the representative of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, the third largest Protestant denomination in the country, with a membership of over 2,600,000 with over 2,300,000 Sunday-school scholars, and about 300,000 members of young people's societies. I have been elected by the general conference as the chairman of the commission on temperance and social service of this church for the past 12 years, and at the meeting of that commission on April 1 last, was requested to represent at this hearing the position of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, as it has been indicated by resolutions unanimously adopted by 340 district conferences, by 54 annual conferences, by the college of bishops, and by the general conference itself. (The influence of Methodism has been consistently and persistently and vigorously thrown against the liquor traffic ever since the establishment of the United Methodist Society by John Wesley nearly 200 years ago, and it is a pleasant duty to place on record at this hearing the attitude of our branch of Methodism on the questions now under consideration by this committee.)

"TO PROMOTE THE GENERAL WELFARE"

The eighteenth, commonly called the prohibition, amendment can not be considered or understood apart from the legislation which preceded it. It is the high-water mark attained after 75 years of effort by the American people to reduce to a minimum the admitted evils from the traffic in intoxicating liquors. The one and the only purpose of the eighteenth amendment is, to quote the words of the preamble to the Constitution, "to promote the general welfare" by the restriction of the activities of the individual citizen in the manufacture, the sale, the transportation, the exportation, and the importation of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. Intoxication is that condition in which a citizen has lost control of his physical, his intellectual, and his moral powers; in short, of himself. The one and only purpose of the eighteenth amendment, therefore, is "to promote the general welfare" by prohibiting the traffic in that which experience has demonstrated does cause hundreds of thousands of citizens to lose control of themselves, and to become, therefore, not only unfitted to perform properly the duties which they owe to the State, society at large, and their families, but frequently also to become a menace and a public nuisance. The fundamental question, therefore, before this committee is whether the eighteenth amendment and the enforcement act, commonly called the Volstead law, "do promote the general welfare." If not, will the legislation under consideration by this committee, if adopted, assist in that purpose?

PREVIOUS CONDITIONS AND LEGISLATION

No proper answer can be given to this question without some consideration of previous conditions and of past liquor legislation. It is difficult for the younger generation to visualize or, indeed, even to credit the actual conditions which existed in the good old days when men put their feet on the brass rail and blew the foam off the glass.

THE TRAFFIC LEGALIZED

1. In those days great distilleries and breweries were running openly and legally full blast, manufacturing hundreds of millions of gallons of intoxicants, saloons running up to the tens of thousands (over 175,000 in all) were found on the prominent corners of every village, town, and city, and intoxicants were sold and drunk publicly by men and women in hotels, high and low; intoxicants were sold in city and country clubs, and were served at practically all public dinners and banquets. To drink until one was a silly fool, or under the table, to be carried home or put to bed by others, was not only no disgrace but a proper ending of a midnight spree.

POLITICAL GRAFT AND CORRUPTION

2. The liquor traffic practically dominated the political life of town, city, State, and Nation. Its heavy hand was felt in elections of mayors, members of city councils, members of the police force, prose-

cuting attorneys, judges on the bench, members of legislatures, Members of Congress, and it insisted upon being consulted even on the matter of presidential nominations. No town or city ordinance, no State or congressional legislation which could possibly affect in any way the moral betterment of the community, the diminution of the sale of intoxicants, or of opportunities for gambling in any of its form, or restrictions upon red-light districts could be considered or adopted without the active, and usually successful opposition of the liquor traffic, acting through some agent or attorney of the State or National Liquor Dealers' Association. For 30 years I personally waged battle after battle with them in town, city, State, and Nation. The traffic had at its command all the forces of the underworld, with every ward heeler and political pimp, linked with men higher up in an ascending scale, until the slimy trail led to the office of the boss of the city or State. The graft and corruption in connection with prohibition enforcement of to-day concerning which so much clamor is raised by the opponents of the prohibition law is but a drop in the bucket, compared with the graft and corruption which prevailed everywhere in the old saloon days. Concerning this condition, the New York Times in an editorial utterance last year declared:

"The politicians ought to know that the country adopted the prohibitory amendment because among other things there had been a corrupting partnership between the saloon and the political organizations. It was difficult, if not impossible, to enforce such regulatory laws concerning the liquor traffic as there were, because the saloonkeeper had a pull with the politicians and was permitted to disregard the law as a reward for his assistance in election. The back room of the saloon was political headquarters, and there was a time when the saloon was the voting place, and the brewers and distillers subsidized political parties as the price to continue winking at irregularities."

A later editorial in the Times in August, 1925, declared:

"A correspondent of the London Observer emphasizes as one of the most important results of prohibition here the present freedom of our politics from saloon or liquor influence and control. That the bootleggers are quite without power in some of our lower political circles could not be denied safely, but it is a petty power compared with that which the saloon keepers of old exercised in practically every State, and nobody questions that the saloon is gone forever from the United States, and nobody ventures to defend it or to demand its return."

To those opponents of prohibition who are denouncing it because of the corruption and graft in connection with the bootlegging traffic, we would commend a study of the horrible conditions in preprohibition days.

SEAT OF VICE AND CRIME

3. In those days the saloon was the rendezvous, the harboring place, the recruiting station of vice and crime. Its allies were the gambling house and the brothel. Its back parlors and its wine rooms were the avenues to debauchery and ruin of multiplied thousands of women and girls. The number of girls and boys ruined to-day by hip-pocket flasks are few indeed compared to the slaughter of the innocents in those days. The immorality of the present day arises more from other causes. The transit from the saloon to the house of ill fame was easy, and intoxicants could be found there when the saloon was closed. Nine-tenths of the saloons were beer saloons, the most of them controlled by the great breweries. They were absolutely lawless. They obeyed no restriction. The brewers paid for police protection, and if some violations were too flagrant, the fines were paid, but the lawlessness continued. The greater part of the drunkenness was beer drunkenness. My college days were spent at a Methodist college in Virginia and a Presbyterian college at Princeton. The authorities of both institutions were opposed to drinking by the students, but there were saloons in both places, and although the law of Virginia forbade the sale of liquor to minors or to students, I helped carry my drunken classmates to their rooms and put them to bed. They were drunk, disgustingly drunk, on beer bought through a runner of the saloons, and there was far more drunkenness among the young people and among the college students in those days than there is to-day. I visited the homes of people in those days and saw husbands lying on the bed in a drunken stupor or so noisy and quarrelsome as to require the police. I saw wives and mothers, gaunt and hollow-eyed, weeping and despairing, working themselves to death to feed and care for their hungry, half-clothed, barefooted children. On one occasion the ladies of my church bought clothing and shoes and a coffin in which to bury a child who had died for lack of proper food, and the next morning when I came for the funeral service the father had taken the clothing and shoes to his saloon keeper and traded them for drink and was back in the house in a drunken rage. Those were some of the features of those days. Well may the opponents of prohibition assert and declare and asseverate that nobody wants the return of the saloons.

SALOON THE ISSUE

But, Mr. Chairman, the question before your committee is at bottom the question of the return of the saloon. We are told that a rose by any other name will smell as sweet, and a saloon by any other name will smell the same. The foul odor that hangs around the word "saloon" was caused by just one thing, namely, the sale of intoxi-

cating liquors for beverage purposes. There is no evil odor attached to an ice-cream saloon, or a soft-drink saloon, because there is no evil result from the sale of those commodities, but the sale of intoxicants anywhere, under any conditions, produces the same evil results to a greater or less extent. The American people became convinced that the conditions to which I have referred above were the natural, inherent, necessary consequences of the traffic in intoxicants, and the legislation which has been adopted had for its purpose the elimination of those evils.

LIQUOR LAWLESSNESS COMPELLED PROHIBITION

4. The lawlessness of the liquor traffic compelled the adoption of national prohibition. Drawing upon my own experience in the State of Virginia for the past 40 years, the steps in liquor legislation have been as follows: Forty years ago licenses were granted by the judges of the court to applicants upon petition by a certain number of citizens who stated that the applicant was a man of good moral character and that the proposed place was a suitable and convenient place for the sale of intoxicating liquors. But the ever-present, destructive, horrible results of the sale of intoxicants became increasingly unbearable. The people demanded and secured a local-option law, but not without exactly the same kind of opposition and denunciation from the liquor traffic and its friends which has been staged at this very hearing before this committee.

The next step was a law enacted by the legislature which prohibited the granting of a license in any community of less than 500 population, unless the judge was satisfied that the granting of such a license would not be contrary to the material or moral interests of the community. This law struck at the very root of the question involved, and be it said to the credit of the Virginia bench that it was not willing to declare that the sale of intoxicants was not contrary to the material and moral interests of the community. This law swept every saloon out of the villages and country districts, and it worked so well that in four years it was extended to apply to communities of 1,000 and less. Then the country districts, the villages, towns, and small cities of the State, but the liquor traffic refusing to recognize the rights of the citizens in the dry territory, entrenched itself in the larger cities of the Commonwealth and endeavored in every possible way to flood the country districts with their prohibited goods. The much vaunted Quebec system is not new in principle. It is practically the old dispensary system of South Carolina, and it was tried by a number of towns in Virginia. It resulted in the establishment of restaurants, so-called, located near the dispensary, the proprietors of which rented tables to purchasers of liquor at the dispensary, and it was simply the transference of the place of drinking. Furthermore, the sale of intoxicants in packages, instead of by the drink, caused the purchase of such large quantities that the purchasers would frequently drink the liquor on their way home, or carry it to their homes and have a drinking party. The system was a failure, both in South Carolina and in Virginia, as any aid to true temperance, and was abolished as every other form of the liquor traffic for its high crimes and misdemeanors. Finally realizing that they could not in any other way protect their communities, their children, and their homes, the people adopted state-wide prohibition by popular vote, thus wiping out the traffic root and branch.

But the liquor traffic utterly refused to recognize the right of the people of Virginia to brand it as an outlaw, and it established liquor-shipping houses, especially in Baltimore, which circularized the State, even boys and college students, with advertisements of liquors and by automobile, railroad, and water craft, carried prohibited intoxicants into Virginia. It was this utter refusal on the part of the liquor traffic to recognize the rights of the States to protect themselves from the liquor traffic which forced the adoption of national prohibition. Senator BRUCE, Governor Ritchie, Governor Smith, Senator EDGE, and the other present-day advocates of the rights of the States to determine their liquor laws for themselves were not in evidence in those days demanding that the rights of the dry States to protection from the liquor traffic of the wet States be respected. Indeed, none of the gentlemen who have appeared at this hearing expressing such great concern as to the morality and sobriety of our people and their hatred of the abominable saloon, not even Mr. Brennan, of Chicago, were prominent in those days in their efforts to protect the morals of the people and to aid in banishing the saloon, which they now all agree is so vile that it can never be permitted to return. (It is hardly to be wondered at that the dry people of the Nation hesitate to follow these present-day apostles of morality and sobriety, but prefer to remain in the ranks of those who recognized and secured the abolition of the admittedly horrible saloon.) The effort was earnestly made to meet the situation by the adoption of the Webb-Kenyon bill and by what is known as the bone-dry Reed amendment, but as long as breweries, distilleries, shipping houses, and saloons were operating legally under the law of the States where located there was no possible way to curtail open legal production, and the intoxicants once having been produced, and the wet States, not only making no effort to pass any form of legislation which would curtail the outflow of intoxicants from

their borders into dry territory, but rejoicing in the increased revenues which came to the wet States from heavy license fees, these liquors, by hook or by crook, by automobile, express, mail, freight, on railroad trains, on launches and steamers leaked—indeed, they poured—into the dry territory.

It can not be too strongly emphasized that it was this lawlessness of the legalized liquor traffic in the wet States and the utter disregard by the wet States not only of the opinions but of the rights of the people of the dry States which not simply precipitated but compelled nation-wide prohibition. The clamorous outcry, coming from thirsty throats in these wet States, that they be permitted to determine for themselves what shall be the legalized alcoholic content of beer and light wines, the solemn assertions made by these present-day States rights advocates that they are perfectly willing that the dry States shall determine what shall be the alcoholic content of beverages sold within their borders, must face fairly and fully the outstanding facts of liquor-legislation history. (Where were these advocates of States rights when the dry States were demanding the observance of their rights in the past?) How can it be expected that the dry States will pay any attention to such appeals or have any confidence in such pledges? Past experience proves conclusively that the liquor traffic respects no pledges. It violates all laws, and it would be folly, even were it constitutional, which it clearly is not, for the dry States of the Nation to agree to any such States rights control of alcoholic content. To legalize breweries and wineries to manufacture such beer and wine as is proposed by these bills would mean a return to the conditions before national prohibition. It would mean the removal of the brand of the outlaw, which is now upon the traffic, and would permit the manufacture and sale of unlimited quantities of beer and wine, and surreptitiously of spirituous liquors, much of which would pour into dry territory as in the past. As the representative of the constituency located largely in those States which suffered in the past from the lawlessness of the liquor traffic in the wet States, I speak for my people and say that we will not surrender the protection which we have secured by the national prohibition law from the lawless, legalized traffic of the wet sector of the Nation. Moreover, we demand that the national prohibition law be enforced in any wet sector of the country at no matter what cost in men or money, in order that the rest of the country may be protected from the contamination from the lawless, outlawed, defiant liquor traffic and its patrons, high or low, just as one section of the country is protected from the foot-and-mouth disease among cattle, or cholera and smallpox among persons, which may be prevalent in another section.

Gentlemen have appeared before this committee and have declared that the prohibition law can not be enforced; indeed, they have gone further than that. They have declared through Senator BRUCE on the floor of the United States Senate itself that there is an element of the population which will refuse to obey the law; that the affluent classes will have their liquor, Constitution or no Constitution. Of course, this is nothing new in the conflict of the people with the liquor traffic and its devotees. They have always declared, either in word or in act, that they will not obey any law which restricts appetite or covetousness. I am not here to declare that the eighteenth amendment and the provisions of the Volstead Act are either observed or enforced universally. No laws of any kind in any country, not even the ten commandments, which admittedly are approved by the moral sense of the average man, are universally obeyed. Men profane the name of God, disobey parents, kill, commit adultery, steal, lie, covet; indeed, men sometimes seem to flaunt themselves in the very face of God. But what community denounces or thinks of calling for the repeal of the ten commandments because they are persistently violated. The question at issue is not whether the ten commandments are violated, but whether it made for the uplift and betterment of humanity that God should express His will in these laws, and tell men what they ought not to do. (The amazing proposition that to prohibit a certain action is to incite disobedience and a determination to do the very thing which has been prohibited is not only false and absurd, but it is an insult to the wisdom and goodness of God. All social community life worthy of the name is based upon reciprocal rights and duties, and is perpetuated by the observance or enforcement of regulations or laws agreed upon by society as necessary "to promote the general welfare.") The fact that some men continually refuse to do their duty and continually infringe upon the rights of others is no reason for the repeal of regulations or laws which are helpful to the social order. There were over 100,000 violations of the traffic laws in New York City alone last year, and a proportionate number throughout the country, resulting in about 25,000 deaths and 700,000 minor injuries.

A very large proportion of these traffic violations arise from careless, headstrong, or selfish chauffeurs who want to drive as they please, without restraint or without regard to the rights of others. New York City is stirred to-day by an investigation of outrageous graft in the handling of the milk supply of the city, in which it is charged that not only milk producers and dealers but city officials are involved. Such violations arise from the covetousness of those involved, which utterly disregard the health of others. In a specially prepared article

in the New York Times about a year ago, it was stated that of the total revenue of over \$1,800,000,000 paid into the United States Treasury from income-tax receipts, \$514,000,000 were added to the payments after officers of the Government had indicated to those making returns the desirability, indeed the necessity, of making these additions, and the article stated that there were probably more violators of the income tax law than of any other law on the statute books, not excepting the Volstead Act, and there were 10,000 investigators in that department. Such violations arise from selfish or covetous unwillingness to bear one's proportionate share for the support of the Government.

Has any clamor arisen for the repeal of the laws indicated above because they are persistently, willfully, and flagrantly violated? The question at issue, therefore, is not whether the prohibition law is observed and enforced universally. It is not whether there is an element of the population which defiantly declares through Senator BRUCE that it will have its liquor, Constitution or no Constitution. It is not whether there are multiplied thousands or even so many millions out of 115,000,000 of people of the United States who openly declare that they will gratify their appetites for intoxicants, regardless of its effect upon the general welfare. Selfish individualism has always placed the gratification of its own appetites and desires above the general welfare, and society has registered its advances by its triumphs over the tyranny of selfish individualism.

IS PROHIBITION BEST METHOD?

Of course, no one is so foolish as to expect that the prohibition law will not be violated just as other laws are violated, but the first great question before this committee for settlement is not whether the prohibition law is observed and enforced, but whether the results obtained have demonstrated that the present prohibition law is a better method of promoting the general welfare than any method which has been tried heretofore. Are physical, economic, moral, and domestic conditions better in the United States since the adoption of the prohibition law, or are they worse? The second question is, Would any of the measures now before the committee, if enacted into law, be beneficial or detrimental to the best interests of the people as a whole?

NEW YORK SECTOR TESTIMONY

It is noteworthy that the testimony which has been presented before the committee by opponents of the present prohibition law has come almost entirely from persons living in what for convenience may be called the New York sector of the country, including the States of New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, with some support from the city of Boston on the east and Chicago on the west. Two of these States, Maryland and New York, have utterly refused to pass any State enforcement law, and yet the very men in these States who are largely responsible for the failure to pass an enforcement law are the ones who are loudly and illogically denouncing the failure to enforce the law. Judged by any ordinary standards, these men do not want the law to be enforced, and how can they expect anyone to be influenced by their clamor about liquor lawlessness in their communities. The State of New Jersey, from which much clamor has arisen, is in the unfortunate position of being dominated by the large foreign-born population of Jersey City and Hudson County, although even New Jersey seems to be improving, for the 88,000 majority given to Senator EDWARDS was reduced to 35,000 given to Governor MOORE, a reduction of over 50,000, and when it is remembered that Hudson County gave approximately 108,000 wet majority, shows that there is a majority of 70,000 in the rest of the State for law enforcement. A similar decrease in majority would wipe out the wet majority entirely in the next election.

Some of the witnesses who testified concerning the lawlessness, drunkenness, and immorality in the sections where they lived and among the people with whom they are acquainted, made such sweeping statements that one is led to wonder what the people themselves who were thus characterized would say. One witness told of touring the country for two years, covering over 30,000 miles, and declared that nowhere did he find any sentiment in support of the Volstead Act. One stated that the making of whisky in the home is becoming general; that 90 per cent of the workmen are either making wine, beer, or whisky. A member of the Maryland Legislature from Baltimore City declared that his business required him to visit in the homes of laboring people, and that in all the homes he visited had a still. A Roman Catholic priest from a mining town in Pennsylvania declared that mothers were violating the law, and girls and boys of 14 were engaging in indecent parties. The Congressman from Jersey City painted a horrible condition of affairs in that city, declaring that prohibition had turned men to the use of drugs, changing drunken husbands into crazy husbands. Now, I am not here to attack the honesty and sincerity of any witness who has testified, but for myself I flatly deny that there are any such conditions in the sections of the country in which I travel, certainly among the people with whom I am brought in contact, either in business, social, or religious matters, or among those people who come under my observation. Since the year 1894 I have been engaged in work which has compelled me to travel the greater part of my time. During the past five years I have averaged

over 200,000 miles yearly. I am familiar with the cities of the South and Southwest. I am frequently for a brief stay in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Buffalo, Detroit, Chicago, Columbus, Louisville, St. Louis, and Kansas City. I average at least two or three visits to New York every month. I am in Cuba and Mexico two or three times every year. I have averaged two trips to Europe for the past six or seven years, and have been to Canada five times during that period. When on the Strand and Fleet Street in London, and in the cafés of Geneva, I have seen more intoxicated persons in a day than I have seen in the United States in a year. Just two weeks ago in Cuba the car in which I was riding was struck by a car of two Cubans drunk on wine.

I have been specially interested in the study of social conditions all my life. From the time of my student days at Princeton. I have rarely been in any city overnight that I have not walked in various sections of those cities for from one to three hours at night, and as I rarely wear clerical clothes, I have not attracted any special attention. I have never seen in any of these cities such horrible conditions as have been described on the witness stand at these hearings, nor can I be made to believe without actual count that 90 per cent of the laboring people of this country are violating the Constitution of the United States, as well as the obligations they owe to their own children by the manufacture of intoxicants in their homes. As an American citizen I repudiate these wholesale assertions as not applying to the great mass of our American people. Certainly they do not apply to the more than 21,000,000 Sunday school scholars, 5,000,000 members of young people's societies, and over 30,000,000 church members of the Protestant churches.

DIFFICULTIES IN ENFORCEMENT

The advocates of changes in the prohibition law have declared that it was impossible to enforce the prohibition law because neither smuggling nor the diversion of alcohol for bootlegging purposes, nor illicit distilling can be prevented. Certainly, these things can not be absolutely entirely prevented. But General Andrews has stated that the smuggling has been so reduced that in his judgment not more than 5 or 10 per cent of the amounts which originally were smuggled in is now being smuggled in. The fact that he did not know how much of the amount that really did manage to slip by was seized is not a matter of any practical importance. That is purely a matter of guess work. The Government officials declare that smuggling for commercial purposes is practically under control. As a matter of fact, Great Britain did not export over 8,000,000 gallons of distilled liquors to the entire world last year, of which amount not more than 5,000,000 could by any possibility have come to North America.

If all of it was smuggled into the United States, it would have amounted to less than one-half pint per capita per annum for the whole country. Mr. Buckner estimated that the amount of alcohol diverted from legitimate purposes to bootlegging purposes was approximately 60,000,000 gallons. But this was purely fantastic guesswork and was more than four times as much as the estimate of the prohibition department. The basis of his calculation that there has been an increase of only 1,000,000 gallons per annum for the past five years in legitimate consumption is unwarranted. The number of automobiles in the country has increased from 10,000,000 to 20,000,000 in the past six years, and the number of closed cars, which can be used in winter with comfort, has increased from about 28 per cent to 85 per cent of the entire number. People are using antifreeze mixture who never used it before, and the amount allotted for that purpose is declared to be over 30,000,000 gallons, which is less than a gallon and a half per car per season. If it be put at only 1 gallon per car per season, the amount would be 20,000,000 gallons for the past year, showing an increase of more than tenfold in excess of Mr. Buckner's estimate of 1,000,000 gallons of this one item alone. As a matter of fact the use of alcohol for legitimate industrial purposes has increased in my own State of Virginia more than 100,000 gallons per year for the past five years, so that an industrial plant has been established in Norfolk to supply the steadily increasing legitimate need.

ILLICIT DISTILLATION

There is undoubtedly much illicit distillation. There always has been. There were moonshiners all through the southern mountains before prohibition, and the appetite for alcohol was not destroyed when the prohibitory law was passed, and, as the Senator from Missouri has demonstrated from time to time before the committee, it is not very difficult to manufacture or expensive to buy some sort of a still. But here, again, outside of the number actually captured by the prohibition officers, all calculation is purely guesswork. It is easy to figure that 175,000 stills of all sorts and sizes captured in a year could each average 40 gallons per day, or a total of 7,000,000 gallons for the 175,000 stills for the day's run, 210,000 gallons for a month, or 2,520,000,000 gallons for a year.

Then if the department captured only one-tenth as it was conjectured, and there are 1,750,000 stills in operation, then the capacity for those stills would be over 25,000,000,000 gallons for a year, which for a population of 115,000,000, would give an average of over 200 gallons per capita per year. If a question of this kind is to be set-

tied by guess work, then, of course, there is no possibility that the prohibition law can be enforced, for the whole country would be deluged with hypothetical liquor from hypothetical stills. If time would permit, I should be very glad to present to the committee in detail certain statistics which I think have a decided bearing on this question of the effects of prohibition, but I have barely time to refer to them. I file with the committee the report of the joint legislative committee on the coordination of civil and criminal practice acts, which report has been made to the present session of the New York Legislature. I simply call the attention of the committee to the statistics found on page 33, which show in Table A all reported convictions in all courts of the State from 1900 to October 31, 1925. Pointing out the convictions for intoxication in the entire State of New York, it is found that the convictions increased from 8,267 to 31,254 in 1917; that they decreased to 5,287 in 1920; that they increased to 17,269 in 1924; and that they decreased to 15,670 in 1925, showing a 50 per cent decrease between 1917 and 1925, although the population of the State has increased several hundred thousand from 1917 to 1925. I also call the attention of the committee to Table H on page 41, which gives the number of persons convicted in courts of record for the year 1925 at 8,914. Of this number 8,427 were reported as temperate, only 436 as intemperate, and 49 unknown, which indicates that only about 5 per cent of the crimes for which persons were convicted were committed by persons addicted to intoxicants, which seems to indicate that the crime wave, which has been attributed by witnesses at this hearing to the drinking of bootleg liquor, is not attributable to that cause.

I also file with the committee the preliminary report of the census of prisoners for 1923 from the Department of Commerce of the United States. On page 3 of this bulletin will be found a table showing the distribution of prisoners according to the offense or crime of which they have been convicted. In both 1910 and 1923 the table shows that the commitments for drunkenness outnumbered those for every other offense, decreasing, however, from 170,914 in 1910 to 91,367 in 1923, which, the census bulletin indicates, making an allowance for an increase in population, showed a ratio of 185.9 per cent per hundred thousand of population in 1910, against 83.1 per cent per hundred thousand in 1923, showing a decrease of 55.3 per cent in convictions for drunkenness in 1923. I know that there are many other tables presented on this question of intoxication, but I present this official bulletin of the United States Government as reliable and most probably indicative of the tremendous effect which prohibition has had upon the convictions for drunkenness.

I also submit the following figures concerning juvenile delinquency compiled by the research department of the World League Against Alcoholism, under the direction of Dr. Robert E. Corradini, from official records of Boston, Cook County, Ill., and New York City. These records show that the arrests of children under 15 in the city of Boston have decreased since 1913 to 1924 from 2,294 to 1,596, and from 1918 from 2,872 to 1,596. The figures from Cook County, including Chicago, for the years 1916 to 1923, inclusive, show that arrests for child delinquency had decreased from 3,308 in 1918 to 1,282 in 1923. The records for delinquent girls in Cook County for the same period show a decrease from 730 in 1918 to 532 in 1923. The records for the children's court of New York from 1913 to 1924 show a steady decrease from 8,015 in 1913 to 4,385 in 1924.

I present records showing the work done by the Children's Aid Society of New York, which indicate a shifting of program of the work of the society, indicating a decrease in purely charity work to an increase in constructive welfare work. For illustration, the number of families under the care of the society decreased from 2,024 in 1914 to 1,261 in 1925. The number of persons sheltered in lodging houses decreased from 6,319 in 1914 to 1,646 in 1925. The number of children benefited through the fresh-air fund increased from 17,000 in 1917 to 116,000 in 1925. The meals given to school children decreased from 637,000 in 1917 to 262,000 in 1925. I also present the statistical data from the Bowery Mission, showing a decrease in charity work, an increase in constructive work, and a great increase in opportunity for spiritual work. I call attention to only one item, namely, that of night's lodging. Men and boys sheltered in night's lodging in 1914 were 44,900; in 1925, 8,760; free meals in 1914, 809,777; in 1925, 67,574.

In order that I might be able to state to this committee the attitude of the people whom I represent, I decided to secure from them an expression of opinion upon certain important factors in the present situation. As chairman of the Commission on Temperance and Social Service, I prepared and sent out a questionnaire to every minister and to every lay leader in the Methodist Episcopal Church South. The questionnaire called for the following information:

Question 1. Did you favor the adoption of the eighteenth amendment?

Question 2. With about how many people are you ordinarily in contact?

Question 3. Are home conditions better or worse since the adoption of prohibition (a) as to food, (b) clothing, (c) home comforts and conveniences, (d) increase in personal ownership of homes, (e) recreation and amusements, (f) school opportunities?

Question 4. Do you personally observe more or less drinking and drunkenness now than in the saloon days (a) in the home, (b) in public places, such as hotels, restaurants, places of amusement, streets, trains, (c) among young people of all classes—laboring, factory, clerks, stenographers, students, society?

Question 5. Would the sale of wine and beer make conditions better or worse in your community?

Question 6. Do you think wine and beer could be manufactured and distributed without the lawlessness and the corruption of the saloon days?

Question 7. Is there as much political graft and corruption to-day as when the saloon dominated town, city, State, and national elections?

Question 8. If the law is not as well enforced in your community as it should be, what suggestions do you make to secure more effective enforcement?

Question 9. In the light of all the facts as you personally see them, not as newspapers or other persons report them, do you still favor prohibition?

Question 10. Is the church in your community as active in its efforts to uphold the law and to conserve its benefits as it was to secure its enactment?

This questionnaire was not sent out until after these hearings began, but already over 6,000 replies have been received, of which the following have been tabulated:

Maryland, 54; Virginia, 510; North Carolina, 432; South Carolina, 262; Georgia, 435; Florida, 160; West Virginia, 236; Ohio, 2; Indiana, 2; Illinois, 34; Kentucky, 330; Tennessee, 565; Alabama, 336; Mississippi, 270; Louisiana, 164; Arkansas, 226; Missouri, 418; Nebraska, 1; Kansas, 6; Colorado, 11; Oklahoma, 154; Texas, 760; New Mexico, 26; Arizona, 16; California, 26; Oregon, 5; Washington, 1; Idaho, 2; Montana, 3; District of Columbia, 11.

The answers to this questionnaire are coming in by every mail, and I shall ask permission of the committee to change these figures and insert the correct number after all the answers have been received and properly tabulated. I think it is proper to emphasize that the answers to the questions given above were made by pastors, presiding elders, educators, editors, connectional officers, and bishops, plus lay leaders of the church, which lay leaders are men chosen by the various congregations throughout Southern Methodism as the one best qualified to lead the congregation in carrying on the varied activities of the church. I believe that the men who have answered this questionnaire are the equal of any other similar number of men in this country in good practical common sense, knowledge of human nature, knowledge of conditions in communities in which they live, genuine interest in the welfare of the people, sincerity, integrity, and general moral character. If they are not patriotic citizens, if they do not love their country, if their sincerity can not be trusted, I know of no men who are patriotic, sincere lovers of their country. Their testimony comes up to this committee not absolutely unanimous on every point but practically so, for the replies received and tabulated up to this time, and out of approximately 6,000 individual answers, all but three declared that home conditions are better since the adoption of prohibition, that food, clothing and comforts, conveniences, increase in personal ownership of homes, recreations, and amusements in the home and public places and among young people than in the saloon days.

All but 10 declare that the sale of wine and beer would make conditions worse in their community. All but 10 declare that they do not think wine and beer could be manufactured and distributed without the lawlessness and corruption of the saloon days, for as many of them state that the sale and distribution of beer would either require beer parlors or saloons, or would turn the home into a drinking place with the evil consequences attendant thereupon. All but six declare that there is not as much political graft and corruption to-day as when the saloon dominated town, city, State, and national elections. All but nine declare that in the light of all the facts as they personally see them they do still favor national prohibition, and all but one of these declare that they prefer prohibition if it were effectively enforced. The very large majority state that in their judgment the churches have not been as active in their efforts to uphold the law and to conserve its benefits as they were to secure its enactment, because the tendency has been to think that now that the law has been passed it is the duty of the Government to make adequate appropriations, elect suitable officers, and to prosecute offenders. The opinion is very generally expressed that the present aggressive activity of the opponents of prohibition will stir the churches to a recognition of the necessity for greater activity in support of the law and of its effective enforcement.

The suggestions made to secure more effective enforcement of the law are naturally somewhat varied, but there are a very few out of the entire number who do not insist upon certain things:

First. That to secure effective enforcement, the work must be committed to those who believe that the prohibition law is a good law, that it can and should be enforced as effectively as other laws of a similar character, such as the narcotic drug act, the income tax law, the Mann law, etc.

Second. It is also insisted that adequate salaries should be paid to secure such men as are qualified to enforce so important and difficult a law.

Third. That whatever number of men are necessary to properly enforce the law in any section of the country should be provided for that section.

Fourth. That the Government should appropriate whatever amount may be necessary to enforce the law.

Fifth. That more stringent penalties should be inflicted upon the violators of the law.

If the Treasury Department considers it of vital importance to have sufficient men and money to enforce effectively the income tax law, which is purely a revenue measure, it is certainly of equal importance to enforce the prohibition law.

As the representative of my people I feel justified in supporting the measures proposed by General Andrews, giving additional search-and-seizure powers in cases of manufacture for sale and for sale itself. The defiant declaration was made by Senator BRUCH on the floor of the Senate itself that the affluent classes will have their liquor, Constitution or no Constitution, is a frank statement of the liquor traffic and its devotees. It is not simply a question of whether the manufacture and the sale of a glass of beer in itself alone should be classed as a misdemeanor or a felony. The issue squarely made to-day is whether the open, defiant declaration that a large body of men are determined to nullify the Constitution, to snap their fingers in the faces of the Government and of the great majority of the American people, which the Government represents, shall be met, as it squarely deserves, by an equally open, positive, clear-cut declaration that the national prohibition law imbedded in the Constitution of the United States shall not be ridiculed, flouted, or nullified, but that the majority of the people will demand of their Government that whatever amount of money may be necessary and whatever force of men may be required to secure proper obedience to the law shall be furnished; that the admittedly remarkable and great benefits which followed the enactment of the law in 1920 and 1921, because the law was generally obeyed, shall be permanently secured for the benefit of the great masses of the people of the country, regardless of the clamor and protests of the defiant, lawless minority.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BRIDGE, PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask unanimous consent for the receipt of a report from the Committee on Commerce on a bill relative to a bridge across the Susquehanna River.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. BINGHAM. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (H. R. 10002) granting the consent of Congress to H. J. Stannert, Harry Wels, and George W. Rockwell to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Susquehanna River from a point in the city of Sunbury, Northumberland County, to a point in the township of Monroe, in Snyder County, in the State of Pennsylvania, and I submit a report (No. 652) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] to it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment of the Committee on Commerce was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to H. J. Stannert, Harry Wels, and George W. Rockwell, their legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Susquehanna River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between a point in the city of Sunbury, Northumberland County, Pa., and a point opposite in the township of Monroe, Snyder County, Pa., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. The said H. J. Stannert, Harry Wels, and George W. Rockwell, their legal representatives and assigns, are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in such act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 3. After the date of completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Pennsylvania, any political subdivision thereof within which any part of such bridge is located, or two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and approaches, and interests in real property necessary therefor, by purchase, or by condemnation in accordance with the law of such State governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation. If at any time after the expiration of 30 years after the completion of such bridge it is acquired by condemnation, the amount of damages or com-

pensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in respect of such bridge and approaches, (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property, (3) actual financing and promotion costs (not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of construction of such bridge and approaches and the acquisition of such interests in real property), and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 4. If such bridge shall at any time be taken over or acquired by any municipality or other political subdivision or subdivisions of the State of Pennsylvania under the provisions of section 3 of this act, and if tolls are charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid for such bridge and its approaches as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of acquiring the bridge and its approaches shall have been provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper care, maintenance, and operation of the bridge and its approaches. An accurate record of the amount paid for the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for operating, repairing, and maintaining the same, and of daily tolls collected shall be kept, and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The said H. J. Stannert, Harry Wels, and George W. Rockwell, their legal representatives and assigns, shall, within 90 days after the completion of such bridge, file with the Secretary of War a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing such bridge and approaches, including the actual cost of acquiring interests in real property and actual financing and promotion costs. Within three years after the completion of such bridge the Secretary of War may investigate the actual cost of such bridge, and for such purpose the said H. J. Stannert, Harry Wels, and George W. Rockwell, their legal representatives and assigns, shall make available to the Secretary of War all of their records in connection with the financing and construction thereof. The finding of the Secretary of War as to such actual original cost shall be conclusive, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 6. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the said H. J. Stannert, Harry Wels, and George W. Rockwell, their legal representatives and assigns, and any corporation to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation.

SEC. 7. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ELIZABETH RIVER BRIDGE, NORFOLK COUNTY, VA.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask unanimous consent for the receipt of a report from the Committee on Commerce in regard to a bridge near Norfolk, Va.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. BINGHAM. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 7093) granting the consent of Congress to O. Emmerson Smith, F. F. Priest, W. P. Jordan, H. W. West, C. M. Jordan, and G. Hubard Massey to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the southern branch of the Elizabeth River at or near the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth, in the county of Norfolk, in the State of Virginia, and I submit a report (No. 653) thereon. I ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment of the Committee on Commerce was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to O. Emmerson Smith, F. F. Priest, W. P. Jordan, H. W. West, C. M. Jordan, and G. Hubard Massey, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the southern branch of the Elizabeth River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth, in the county of Norfolk, in the State of Virginia, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of

bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

The construction of such bridge shall not be commenced nor shall any alterations of such bridge be made either before or after its completion until the plans and specifications for such construction or alterations have been first submitted to and approved by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting jointly, and they, acting jointly, shall determine whether the location selected is feasible for the erection of such bridge without obstructions in navigation and without being detrimental to the development of interstate and foreign as well as domestic commerce moving to and from the particular location on the southern branch of the Elizabeth River to the inland waters of the State concerned, and whether public convenience will be served by such bridge as a connecting link between the Federal-aid highway systems of the State of Virginia. The said Secretaries, acting jointly, are empowered and, if requested to do so, are directed to hold public hearings for the full and complete determination of said precedent requirements.

SEC. 2. That said O. Emmerson Smith, F. F. Priest, W. P. Jordan, H. W. West, C. M. Jordan, and G. Hubard Massey, their successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in such act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 3. After the date of completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Virginia, any political subdivision thereof within which any part of such bridge is located, or two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and approaches, and interests in real property necessary therefor, by purchase, or by condemnation in accordance with the law of such State governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation. If at any time after the expiration of 20 years after the completion of such bridge it is acquired by condemnation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in respect of such bridge and approaches, (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property, (3) actual financing and promotion costs (not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of construction of such bridge and approaches and the acquisition of such interests in real property), and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 4. If such bridge shall at any time be taken over or acquired by any municipality or other political subdivision or subdivisions of the State of Virginia, under the provisions of section 3 of this act, and if tolls are charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid for such bridge and its approaches as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of acquiring the bridge and its approaches shall have been provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper care, maintenance, and operation of the bridge and its approaches. An accurate record of the amount paid for the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for operating, repairing, and maintaining the same, and of daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The said O. Emmerson Smith, F. F. Priest, W. P. Jordan, H. W. West, C. M. Jordan, and G. Hubard Massey, their successors and assigns, shall, within 90 days after the completion of such bridge, file with the Secretary of War a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing such bridge and approaches, including the actual cost of acquiring interests in real property and actual financing and promotion costs. Within three years after the completion of such bridge the Secretary of War may investigate the actual cost of such bridge, and for such purpose the said O. Emmerson Smith, F. F. Priest, W. P. Jordan, H. W. West, C. M. Jordan, and G. Hubard Massey, their successors and assigns, shall make available to the Secretary of War all of their records in connection with the financing and construction thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to such actual original cost shall be conclusive, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 6. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the said O. Emmerson Smith, F. F. Priest, W. P. Jordan, H. W. West, C. M. Jordan, and G. Hubard Massey, their successors and assigns, and any corporation to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation.

SEC. 7. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, April 24, 1926, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 23 (legislative day of April 19), 1926

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Charles R. Nash, of Minnesota, to be assistant to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. New office created by section 1201 (b), (2) of the revenue act of 1926.

GENERAL COUNSEL FOR THE BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Alexander W. Gregg, of Texas, to be general counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. New office created by section 1201 (a) of the revenue act of 1926.

REAPPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY

GENERAL OFFICERS

To be brigadier generals, reserve

Brig. Gen. Edgar Stilson Jennings, reserve (brigadier general, New York National Guard), from November 4, 1926.

Brig. Gen. Milton Atchison Reckord, reserve (brigadier general, Maryland National Guard), from November 4, 1926.

Brig. Gen. Jacob Franklin Wolters, reserve (brigadier general, Texas National Guard), from July 18, 1926.

Brig. Gen. William Church Davis, auxiliary reserve, from November 4, 1926.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

SIGNAL CORPS

First Lieut. Richard Turner Schlosberg, Infantry (detailed in Signal Corps), with rank from July 1, 1920.

FIELD ARTILLERY

Capt. Henry Alfred Schwarz, Infantry, with rank from June 25, 1920.

INFANTRY

Second Lieut. Ernest Avner Suttles, Air Service, with rank from June 12, 1925.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE COLONEL

Lieut. Col. Philip Sheridan Golderman, Field Artillery, from April 16, 1926.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS

Maj. Dean Halford, Infantry, from April 16, 1926.

Maj. Ralph Willcox Kingman, Infantry, from April 16, 1926.

TO BE MAJORS

Capt. Charles Franklin Eddy, Finance Department, from April 16, 1926.

Capt. William Maynard Dixon, Finance Department, from April 16, 1926.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Josephine M. Costar to be postmaster at Greenville, Calif., in place of J. M. Costar. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Bernard G. Larrecou to be postmaster at Menlo Park, Calif., in place of B. G. Larrecou. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

COLORADO

Anna B. Danford to be postmaster at Haswell, Colo., in place of A. B. Danford. Incumbent's commission expired March 27, 1926.

Hugh L. Large to be postmaster at Longmont, Colo., in place of H. L. Large. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Daniel Vigil to be postmaster at Saguache, Colo., in place of Daniel Vigil. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1926.

Roy H. Horner to be postmaster at Wiley, Colo., in place of R. H. Horner. Incumbent's commission expired April 14, 1926.

CONNECTICUT

Mary H. Newton to be postmaster at Uncasville, Conn., in place of M. H. Newton. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

William M. Logan to be postmaster at West Cheshire, Conn., in place of W. M. Logan. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

GEORGIA

Hardy L. Holland to be postmaster at Register, Ga., in place of R. G. Riggs, resigned.

ILLINOIS

George V. Robinson to be postmaster at Forrest, Ill., in place of G. V. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired October 19, 1925.

Frances Baker to be postmaster at Golconda, Ill., in place of Frances Baker. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

William L. Bauman to be postmaster at Iuka, Ill., in place of W. L. Bauman. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1926.

Ora C. Baiar to be postmaster at Johnston City, Ill., in place of O. C. Baiar. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1926.

Herman W. Behrens to be postmaster at Kampsville, Ill., in place of H. W. Behrens. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

Rola Eubanks to be postmaster at Omaha, Ill., in place of Rola Eubanks. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Walter A. Foster to be postmaster at Steward, Ill., in place of W. A. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

John J. Barton to be postmaster at Sublette, Ill., in place of J. J. Barton. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

Clara A. Hollow to be postmaster at Trenton, Ill., in place of C. A. Hollow. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Russell P. Garrison to be postmaster at Wayne City, Ill., in place of R. P. Garrison. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

William E. West to be postmaster at Yates City, Ill., in place of L. S. Soldwell, removed.

INDIANA

Katheryn L. Huckleberry to be postmaster at Whitestown, Ind., in place of K. L. Huckleberry. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

William H. Jones to be postmaster at Logansport, Ind., in place of J. M. Johnston, deceased.

IOWA

Glen M. Reynolds to be postmaster at Irwin, Iowa, in place of G. M. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1926.

KANSAS

John L. Lee to be postmaster at Atlanta, Kans., in place of J. L. Lee. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

David E. Hill to be postmaster at Nortonville, Kans., in place of D. E. Hill. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Francis B. Brungardt to be postmaster at Victoria, Kans., in place of F. B. Brungardt. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

KENTUCKY

Anna Harris to be postmaster at Prestonsburg, Ky., in place of Anna Harris. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1926.

Thomas D. Tapp to be postmaster at Springfield, Ky., in place of T. D. Tapp. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

LOUISIANA

Ella Farr to be postmaster at Gilliam, La., in place of Ella Farr. Incumbent's commission expired March 27, 1926.

MASSACHUSETTS

Walter L. Burt to be postmaster at Canton, Mass., in place of W. L. Burt. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

MICHIGAN

Augustus J. Bills to be postmaster at Grand Ledge, Mich., in place of A. J. Bills. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1926.

Wynne C. Garvin to be postmaster at Millington, Mich., in place of W. C. Garvin. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

MINNESOTA

E. Jay Merry to be postmaster at Fairmont, Minn., in place of E. J. Merry. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Sarah E. Jones to be postmaster at Zimmerman, Minn., in place of S. E. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

MISSISSIPPI

Harry Howe to be postmaster at Shelby, Miss., in place of Harry Howe. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1926.

MISSOURI

Lavinia B. Jones to be postmaster at Pilot Grove, Mo., in place of L. B. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1926.

MONTANA

Gale E. McKain to be postmaster at Eureka, Mont., in place of M. C. McKain. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1926.

J. R. Wotring to be postmaster at Warland, Mont., in place of G. W. Shearer, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Henry J. Steinhausen to be postmaster at Creighton, Nebr., in place of H. J. Steinhausen. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

Ray H. Surber to be postmaster at Davenport, Nebr., in place of R. H. Surber. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

James E. Scott to be postmaster at Osmond, Nebr., in place of J. E. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

James D. Finley to be postmaster at Sargent, Nebr., in place of J. D. Finley. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

NEVADA

Emanuel Bollschweiler to be postmaster at Wells, Nev., in place of Emanuel Bollschweiler. Incumbent's commission expired April 18, 1926.

NEW JERSEY

Eva H. Ketcham to be postmaster at Belvidere, N. J., in place of E. H. Ketcham. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

John Boyd to be postmaster at Greystone Park, N. J., in place of John Boyd. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Peter A. Greiner, jr., to be postmaster at Woodbridge, N. J., in place of P. A. Greiner, jr. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

NEW YORK

Everett H. Axtell to be postmaster at Deposit, N. Y., in place of E. H. Axtell. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

May M. Ferry to be postmaster at Edwards, N. Y., in place of M. M. Ferry. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

William F. Hadley to be postmaster at North Bangor, N. Y., in place of W. F. Hadley. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1926.

Raymond C. Green to be postmaster at Sauquoit, N. Y., in place of R. C. Green. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

Sarah M. Taylor to be postmaster at Westbury, N. Y., in place of S. M. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

NORTH CAROLINA

Richard S. White, sr., to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, N. C., in place of R. S. White, sr. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

OHIO

Ernest C. Ludwig to be postmaster at Anna, Ohio, in place of E. C. Ludwig. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Ray V. Chase to be postmaster at Archbold, Ohio, in place of R. V. Chase. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Frederick O. Bates to be postmaster at Bellevue, Ohio, in place of F. O. Bates. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

James E. Davis to be postmaster at Belmont, Ohio, in place of J. E. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.
Herbert S. Cannon to be postmaster at Canal Winchester, Ohio, in place of H. S. Cannon. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1926.

George S. Laskey to be postmaster at Custar, Ohio, in place of G. S. Laskey. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

John J. Haines to be postmaster at East Liberty, Ohio, in place of J. J. Haines. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Ruth G. McWilliams to be postmaster at Grand Rapids, Ohio, in place of R. G. McWilliams. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Addie F. Hosler to be postmaster at Kingston, Ohio, in place of A. F. Hosler. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Arthur R. Hurd to be postmaster at Lawndale, Ohio, in place of A. R. Hurd. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Reinhart W. Kuck to be postmaster at New Bremen, Ohio, in place of R. W. Kuck. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

William M. Freeman to be postmaster at Otway, Ohio, in place of W. M. Freeman. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Everett F. Funk to be postmaster at Warsaw, Ohio, in place of E. F. Funk. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

OKLAHOMA

Guy E. Reece to be postmaster at Braggs, Okla., in place of G. E. Reece. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

Lillie M. Sheel to be postmaster at Burbank, Okla., in place of L. M. Sheel. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1925.

George Rainey to be postmaster at Enid, Okla., in place of George Rainey. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Manford Burk to be postmaster at Hooker, Okla., in place of W. P. Morris, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Albert S. Leiby to be postmaster at Bath, Pa., in place of A. S. Leiby. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Robert S. Bowman to be postmaster at Berwick, Pa., in place of R. S. Bowman. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Elwood S. Rothermel to be postmaster at Fleetwood, Pa., in place of E. S. Rothermel. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

Elwood M. Stover to be postmaster at Kulpville, Pa., in place of E. M. Stover. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

Grant Piper to be postmaster at Petersburg, Pa., in place of Grant Piper. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Mabel M. Myer to be postmaster at Ronks, Pa., in place of M. M. Myer. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

Herman Raithel to be postmaster at Smithton, Pa., in place of Herman Raithel. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William T. Stewart to be postmaster at Camden, S. C., in place of W. D. Trantham. Incumbent's commission expired April 14, 1924.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Charles H. Hess, jr., to be postmaster at Blunt, S. Dak., in place of C. H. Hess, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1926.

Arthur H. Siem to be postmaster at Clark, S. Dak., in place of A. H. Siem. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Jennie Dodge to be postmaster at Egan, S. Dak., in place of Jennie Dodge. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

TEXAS

Florence M. Geyer to be postmaster at College Station, Tex., in place of F. M. Geyer. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Clarence R. Redden to be postmaster at Le Leon, Tex., in place of C. R. Redden. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

John C. Beaver to be postmaster at Perryton, Tex., in place of J. C. Beaver. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Thomas B. White to be postmaster at Rogers, Tex., in place of T. B. White. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Herman C. Feist to be postmaster at Rowena, Tex., in place of H. C. Feist. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

William F. Viereck to be postmaster at Sealy, Tex., in place of W. F. Viereck. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Don A. Parkhurst to be postmaster at Tahoka, Tex., in place of D. A. Parkhurst. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

John W. Osborne to be postmaster at West Columbia, Tex., in place of J. W. Osborne. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Charles C. Eppright to be postmaster at Manor, Tex., in place of A. T. Cook, resigned.

Howard F. McWilliams to be postmaster at Queen City, Tex., in place of R. E. Jackson, resigned.

UTAH

John A. Israelsen to be postmaster at Hyrum, Utah, in place of J. A. Israelsen. Incumbent's commission expires April 24, 1926.

VERMONT

Charles H. Austin to be postmaster at Richford, Vt., in place of W. J. Reirden, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Paul E. Haden to be postmaster at Palmyra, Va., in place of P. E. Haden. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Jessie H. Cox to be postmaster at Washington, Va., in place of J. H. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Herbert T. Thomas to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Va., in place of H. T. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

WASHINGTON

Richard A. McKellar to be postmaster at Cashmere, Wash., in place of R. A. McKellar. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Joseph A. Dean to be postmaster at Castlerock, Wash., in place of J. A. Dean. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

William R. Wells to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Wash., in place of W. R. Wells. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1926.

Helen M. Purvis to be postmaster at Sumner, Wash., in place of H. M. Purvis. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1926.

Joseph F. Lavigne to be postmaster at Cusick, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

WEST VIRGINIA

Sylvester V. Riggs to be postmaster at St. Marys, W. Va., in place of S. V. Riggs. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1925.

WISCONSIN

Mae F. Harris to be postmaster at Goodman, Wis., in place of M. F. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired October 3, 1925.

WYOMING

W. Leroy Call to be postmaster at Afton, Wyo., in place of W. L. Call. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

Chester A. Lindsley to be postmaster at Yellowstone Park, Wyo., in place of C. A. Lindsley. Incumbent's commission expires April 25, 1926.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 23 (legislative day of April 19), 1926

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Charles R. Nash to be assistant to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

GENERAL COUNSEL FOR THE BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Alexander W. Gregg to be general counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

POSTMASTERS

KANSAS

Guy H. Byarlay, Green.

Isabel Brown, Lansing.

PENNSYLVANIA

Elmer E. Brunner, York Haven.

VIRGINIA

Charles R. Coakley, Arrington.
 Anthony Hart, Clifton Station.
 Philip B. Nourse, East Falls Church.
 James F. Walker, Fort Defiance.
 Homo D. Gleason, Lovingsston.
 Ann E. Copps, Schuyler.
 Emeline P. Lacy, Scottsburg.
 Eva C. Hudson, Tye River.
 George W. Hammontree, Yorktown.

WEST VIRGINIA

Sewell J. Champe, Montgomery.
 Wendell Evans, Winona.

WISCONSIN

Elmer Carlson, Brantwood.
 Henry C. Scheller, Cecil.
 Eugene F. Stoddard, Downing.
 Simon Skroch, Independence.
 Charles Pearson, La Valle.
 Carrie B. Carter, Lyndon Station.
 Carlton C. Good, Neshkoro.
 Emmet W. Zimmerman, Phelps.
 Harry Bradley, Taylor.
 Edmund O. Johnson, Warrens.
 Oscar M. Waterbury, Williams Bay.
 George E. King, Winneconne.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, April 23, 1926

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou hast blest and trusted us. We desire above all things to be worthy of Thy confidence. Have mercy upon us. Let not the evil in our hearts darken the outlook of our souls. May all our lives be magnified in wisdom, charity, and humility. We wonder of Thy loving patience. Oh, do Thou help us to escape the tendencies of our own desires and ambitions. Show us real values and teach us the larger meaning of the commonplace. Make us strong of will, so that we shall be overcomers in the presence of all temptations. Provide a way for the discouraged, the wounded, and the sick. Bless us with a hunger for all those virtues that lift us to the highest service for our country. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON] requested that there be inserted in the RECORD the remarks of Commissioner Burke taken at a hearing before the Committee on Indian Affairs. That request was made when I was not present. I knew nothing about it, but objection was heard, and afterwards I was asked if there was objection on my part, and I said no, but I would like at the same time to make a brief statement when it was inserted in the RECORD. I have tried to get time, but I find that the time is all promised. I now ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the order this morning I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the order heretofore made this morning he may be allowed to address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. When does the gentleman want to speak?

Mr. FREAR. At the conclusion of the remarks of other gentlemen who have been given leave to address the House.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. May I inquire upon what subject?

Mr. FREAR. With reference to Indian affairs. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON] asked to insert the testimony of Commissioner Burke in the RECORD, to which I consented.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HUDSON. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if it is to continue the discussion that he already has had in the RECORD?

Mr. FREAR. It is for the purpose of answering the remarks of the commissioner, who had the exclusive right to talk for almost three hours before the committee.

Mr. HUDSON. I do not want to object, but the gentleman from Wisconsin had plenty of time in committee and did not take the time. I do not think the RECORD ought to be encumbered with this.

Mr. FREAR. The commissioner talked for about three hours without interruption. I only want 15 minutes now.

Mr. HUDSON. Can not the gentleman take another day?

Mr. FREAR. I want it to go in to-morrow, and I understand that there may be an adjournment over to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 9831. An act to provide for the completion and repair of customs buildings in Porto Rico; and

H. R. 7372. An act to amend section 27 of the general leasing act approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. p. 437).

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 2368. An act for the relief of Ocean Steamship Co. (Ltd.), a British corporation; and

S. 1486. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lease to the Bush Terminal Railroad Co. and to the Long Island Railroad use of railway tracks at Army supply base, South Brooklyn, N. Y.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9688) granting the consent of Congress to the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across Sandusky Bay at or near Baybridge, Ohio.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 750. An act to amend paragraph (18) of section 1 of the interstate commerce act, as amended;

S. 1490. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York;

S. 2348. An act for the relief of Nick Masonich;

S. 2620. An act for the relief of certain newspapers for advertising services rendered the Public Health Service of the Treasury Department;

S. 2657. An act to amend section 217, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909;

S. 2716. An act to provide for the collection of fees from royalties on production of minerals from leased Indian lands;

S. 3284. An act to amend a portion of section 15 of an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920;

S. 3560. An act to authorize the granting of leave to ex-service men and women to attend the annual convention of the American Legion in Paris, France, in 1927; and

S. 3732. An act making appropriations for the Hillcrest and Black Canyon units of the Boise reclamation project, Idaho.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills and resolution of the following titles:

On April 21, 1926:

H. R. 6730. An act to detach Fulton County from the Jonesboro division of the eastern judicial district of the State of Arkansas and attach the same to the Batesville division of the eastern judicial district of said State;

H. R. 7455. An act to legalize the submarine cable laid in the St. Louis River at the Spirit Lake Transfer Railway drawbridge, between New Duluth, Minn., and Oliver, Wis., and used for the lighting of the village of Oliver, Wis.;

H. J. Res. 213. Joint resolution for participation of the United States in the Third World's Poultry Congress to be held at Ottawa, Canada, in 1927; and

H. R. 6355. An act providing for the acquirement by the United States of privately owned lands in San Miguel, Mora, Taos, and Colfax Counties, N. Mex., within the Mora grant, and adjoining one or more national forests, by exchanging therefor lands or timber within the exterior boundaries of any